CROZER QUARTERLY

Volume XXVI APRIL, 1949 Number 2

WE BELIEVE IN LIBERTY, BUT—

ARTHUR C. BALDWIN

Chestnut Street Baptist Church, Philadelphia

THE STORY is told of an earnest preacher who was warning his people against compromise. Too many with an impeccable Christian creed made private reservations. They believed, yes, but— and he added impressively, "They are sliding down into hell on their buts."

Our free institutions face a similar danger. We believe in liberty, certainly. This is "the land of the free and the home of the brave," but sometimes the Negro feels left out. We welcome opportunities for free enterprise and contrast ourselves with dictator states. We are not afraid of the police terror by night or of the autocratic oppression that wasteth at noonday. There is no policeman at our church doors, and no document other than a ticket is needed for travel. Yes, we believe in liberty, but— and this word like charity covers a multitude of sins, evasions, qualifications, denials that tend to nullify the high profession. It is to these and their meaning that we would direct attention.

I

The first thing we must note is change. Our free institutions face a change of climate. Whatever the lip service, there are missing today the sharp suspicions and jealous watch care that once asked the effect of this or that upon our liberties. No longer are we fearful. Our liberties are something which was and which is and which ever shall be, world without end. Nonetheless there is change.

Individualism is giving way to collectivism. Controls in transportation, the utilities, and monopolistic business are accepted as matters of course. The common man is no longer free to hire out at a rate agreeable to himself and his employer. His hours and the tempo of his work are determined for him. He must join the union and every day be a man under authority. No longer, like the pioneer, can he go where he wills and hew out a living according to his ability and desire.

Authority also has entered the academic world. Last summer, Pravda denounced Zhebrak, a noted scientist, for declaring that hereditary characteristics are controlled by genes which cannot be altered by environmental

conditions. Such doctrine was heresy, and, like Galileo, the unfortunate scientist found himself condemned without a hearing and called on to retract. This he did promptly and humbly. "As a party member," he wrote, "I do not consider it possible for me to retain the views which have been recognized as erroneous by the Control Committee of our party."

Regretfully we must acknowledge that this can happen here. Scott Nearing was dismissed from the faculty of the University of Pennsylvania because of the pressure of business interests. Tennessee has or had a law forbidding the teaching of evolution and the biological facts involved. The dismissal of liberals from the faculties of theological seminaries is an old story. Recently the University of Wyoming had a witch-hunting committee appointed by the trustees to find out what economic instruction was being given by the faculty.

Authority is speaking in a growing, widening censorship. At first this was justified on the ground of morality. Last year in Philadelphia in a sudden spasm of virtue the police raided reputable bookstores and confiscated two thousand books which were being freely sold elsewhere. A hundred pastors in their meeting applauded this action. The maker of the motion which condemned the books read some samples of anti-religious and obscene sentences and affirmed that there were many more like them in these books. The conclusion for the ministers was logical and inevitable. The books were bad; therefore they must be banned. Q.E.D.

This censorship business seems to be on the increase. The police of various municipalities are showing an unsuspected literary interest. Last spring in Boston, according to newspaper report, the movie version of *Hamlet* was forbidden until certain Shakespearean quotations had been expurgated. In Portland, Maine, the chief of police recently discovered that Erskine Caldwell's writings were impure and banned *God's Little Acre,* published in 1938, *Journeyings,* published in 1916, and *Tragic Ground,* published in 1911. The race question is another potent cause of censorship.

Even our newspapers and magazines must be purged. Sometimes this is done from within as editors feel the sway of partisan, economic, or patriotic influences. Whatever the cause, there are items that cannot get into print, and the reader knows regarding some matters that he is not getting the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. News is colored; headlines say one thing and the text another. Advertisers have to be considered, and so on.

A more serious pressure can come from religious interests. In Newark the *Nation* has been removed from the libraries of four high schools on account of articles reflecting, it is claimed, on the Roman Catholic Church, and when its editor protested, the Newark Board of Education with five

Catholics, three Protestants, and one Jew unanimously approved the action. In Trenton, school officials clipped the offending articles from the magazine before it was put in the libraries. In New York City it was recently discovered that the *Nation* had quietly been dropped because it criticised the stand of the Roman Catholic Church on fascism, science, and censorship of books and movies. Not with impunity can a paper or magazine tell what it regards as the truth regarding entrenched interests.

In order to have self-government democracy has recognized the need of high intelligence and character on the part of the electorate. In practise, however, democracy has come to mean the rule of a minority and that the least intelligent. A standing indictment of the practicality of democracy and of the ability of people to rule themselves is seen in the record of boss rule in our cities and states. The names of Huey Long, Curry, Flynn, Pendergast, Kelly, Vare, and Crump point to indifference and neglect, not only of individual citizens, but also to large business interests that prefer a deal with the machine at a known price to the uncertain whims that run with reform.

Yes, we believe in liberty, but—the blundering inefficiency of democracy in times of crisis, the quick turning of the people in such moments to dictators and authority, the clamor of all sorts and conditions for their rights with little attention to their duties, all raise the question whether the American people really want the free institutions they have inherited.

II

Various reasons may be offered for these changes. One is that we are adapting ourselves to new conditions. New occasions teach new duties. A growing nation has to leave the horse-and-buggy age behind. Like the outmoded town meeting and the vestigial remnant known as the electoral college, some of the old ways have ceased to be useful. Free speech has its limitations as our libel laws indicate. Only a crazy man would cry "Fire!" in a crowded assembly. Society has the right to quarantine disease and a corresponding right to quarantine ideas when the public health demands protection. We can forbid throwing garbage into the street and likewise the sending of pornographic books through the mail. In a complex society the rights of one are limited by the rights of another. As Calvin Coolidge said of the police strike in Boston, "There is no right to strike against the public safety by anybody, anytime, or anywhere." In a free country, society has not given up the right to protect itself. That such authority may be abused and used oppressively may be admitted. Nevertheless, the right exists.

Also, some changes in our concept of liberty are distinctly indications of growth. In an experiment that has run for only 150 years it should be

expected that there will be amendments and a change in fundamental law. Self-rule is usually expressed in blundering and inefficient ways, and our freedom means that we are not cast in an unchanging mold. If a way proves not to be good, a free people will give it up and do something else. After all, efficiency of government is not the main thing, but liberty is. The real question in a given case is not what has happened but what has been learned, not where we are but whither bound. When a Filipino patriot was told his people were not ready for liberty, his hot reply was, "Better hell and liberty than heaven and slavery." He believed that, given time, a free people would abolish hell. They would learn by blunderings and failures. When reproached for the failures of democracy as compared with dictator efficiency, our answer is, We are not through yet. The mutineers of the *Bounty* made a stable society on Pitcairn Island. Australia was colonized with England's criminals, but their descendants have helped to make a strong commonwealth. So too America in spite of blunders can believe it is on the way.

Another and deeper reason for the changes is found in a change of faith. We do not believe all that the fathers believed when Liberty Bell first was rung. Some of the fundamentals of liberty are now in question, for example, our ideas about law and order. Once we thought them solid and unchanging; truth was axiomatic and would assert and justify itself in time. This was what Washington referred to when he said in the Constitutional Convention, "Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. The event is in the hand of God." And it was this that emerged when after bitter debate the new constitution was finally adopted. In the end, when sufficiently informed, the voice of the people was the voice of God.

This faith now seems to be shaken. We are losing faith in the people. There is doubt as to the power of righteousness to assert itself and the fear that even if the truth were known it could not overcome the false. Today the Pandora's box of force has been opened, and we cannot count the number of imps of hell that have been released. Here a comparison may be made with Russia. Both nations, Russia and our own, must deal with reality that is the truth, and both respect the truth. The Kremlin apparently believes in the truth so much that it is afraid of it and pulls down the Iron Curtain to keep it out. It realizes it has made two great mistakes, it has shown the Russian army to Europe and it has shown Europe to the Russian army. To allow more of this truth to come in would be disastrous; therefore every instrument at its disposal is being used to keep it out.

In contrast is our western fear *for* the truth. We are fearful lest it be overwhelmed and we seek to defend it, to bolster it up and silence its

enemies by refusing them liberty to speak. One method of fighting communism would be to allow it to make its claims in full and then to answer it with the facts of American experience. Have the whole thing aired in open debate. Instead, our fear drives it underground, a method that tells of panic rather than faith. Truth is our answer to error—our positive faith in America, its institutions, what it has done for all classes of citizens. According to the old faith, if the Voice of America should tell the world convincingly of what free enterprise has meant, the high standard of life it has made possible, the right of every youth to go where he pleases and work at what he likes, then the false claims would be overcome. It is truth that is needed and confidence, not fear for it.

In his first inaugural, Thomas Jefferson, whom Judge Maxey calls "the most profound philosopher ever to sit in the White House," said: "If there be any among us who wish to dissolve this union or to change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which errors of opinion can be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it."

In contrast to this calm faith is our recent record with bills introduced in Congress to establish guilt by association; so that a scientist like Condon could be condemned, not for anything he had done save that he had been seen speaking with a suspected character. Jefferson's address, it may be recalled, was given when the memory of the infamous Alien and Sedition Act was still fresh. This act was meant to suppress all criticism of the Federalist Party and to destroy the Jacobins, the Jeffersonians, the radicals and their democratic institutions with one deadly blow. It virtually abolished the Bill of Rights and set up a reign of terror of its own.

Probably in Jefferson's mind was a confidence that the false, if spoken, would be immediately refuted. He believed that men would quickly rise to defend the truth and that then in the clarifying light of public debate the issue would be made plain. Experience, however, tells a different story. Instead of active, heated debate appear public inertia and indifference. In consequence subversive words have been left free to do their deadly work. This was pointed out years before in the pamphlet, *The Art of Political Lying,* frequently attributed to Jonathan Swift. And recently the New York *Times* paraphrased the words of the satirist: "It often happens that if a lie is believed only for an hour it has done its work and there is no more occasion for it. Falsehood flies and truth comes limping after; so that when a man comes to be undeceived it is too late; the jest is over and the tale is told. It is like a man who has thought up a good repartee when the discourse has changed and the company has separated."

Moscow took advantage of this when it spread the false story about

Mrs. Kasenkina and Mr. Samarin. Of course the story would be shown to be false in a few hours, but if a large number of people could be made to believe it for those few hours, its work was done. The truth might come limping after, but so far as the communist censorship was concerned the truth could never even limp behind the Iron Curtain.

Such distortions and manipulations of public sentiment reveal the public sloth. Zephaniah referred to this when he denounced the men who were "settled on their lees," with no interest in public affairs. George Adam Smith, in commenting upon this charge, reminds us that "the great causes of God and Humanity are not defeated by the hot assaults of the Devil, but by the slow, crushing, glacier-like masses of thousands and thousands of indifferent nobodies. God's causes are never destroyed by being blown up, but by being sat upon. It is not the violent and anarchical whom we have to fear in the war for human progress, but the slow, the staid, the respectable."

Certainly it is evident that the changes now apparent in our social and public institutions represent more than an adaptation to a new day and a growing wisdom. Rather do they repeat the old, old story of institutions that have lost their freshness and of people who have wearied of idealism and constant effort. In such a moment they must be reminded that liberties do not walk alone and truth needs its advocates. It is a dangerous mood when a people once free are ready to accept a less arduous way because it does not cost so much.

III

There are trends in modern life that should be examined for their effect on our liberties and free institutions. One is the growing centralization of power in the national government with the attendant paternalism. This includes powerful bureaucracies whose administration reaches out to the remotest hamlet. Other massive governmental enterprises, interstate highways, mighty dams, the supervision of elections so far as they deal with Washington, educational grants with the prospect that he who pays the piper calls the tune, selective and universal military service—these and other national developments tell the same story of the shifting of power and responsibility from local centres and individuals to a central, vast, impersonal governmental authority.

Free enterprise is on the wane. A recent decision of the Supreme Court declared it to be unlawful for a firm at the end of a year to give a bonus or merit raise above the union scale to outstanding employees. Only after consultation and with the consent of the union (and we know how hard that would be to get) can such a reward be given. This applies to nonunion as well as to union labor if the union is the bargaining agent for all employees.

Shades of Patrick Henry! These merit bonuses have been regarded as a potent stimulus to good work and so a benefit to the employer himself. Commented the New York *Times*: "The principle established by the Court is a hazardous one in any kind of free economy, free enterprise, for the employee as well as for the employer. It takes from the resourceful employee his chance individually to increase his earnings."

This growing national supervision seems the more serious when we realize that it has come about because state, city, and hamlet have through greed or indifference abdicated their own responsibility. When a people have so lost their joy of liberty that they can be complacent under the rule of corrupt machines, they are in no position to resist autocracy. A Curry or Talmadge in the saddle indicates that people have already accepted a yoke of bondage.

Judge Maxey, of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, calls the paternalism that has developed with this centralization of power a major problem for Americans today.

> All history proves that exactly to the extent a government becomes paternalistic every citizen's right to the fruits of his toil become insecure. Every new largess bestowed by a government on favored individuals means just so much more substance taken from the fruits of other individuals' labor. As a government increases its power to do things for people, it must increase its power to do things to people. When government becomes coterminous with the sphere of society (the aim of Socialists and Communists) it, to be efficient, must be administered by a dictator.
>
> The nearer any government comes to supervising all human activities of its people, the nearer it comes to failure. The more a people depend on self-control and the less they depend on bureaucratic control, the stronger they will be both individually and as a nation and the more efficient will be their government.
>
> A self-reliant people is always a stronger people both in war and in peace than a self-indulgent people. History reveals that the people who have achieved their freedom and independence and who have been able to maintain what they had achieved were persistent peoples rather than protected peoples. When a country drifts away from its ancient practises and repudiates the principles that made it great, it is hastening to its doom.

The situation at best is confused. Often national authority seems needed because of local chicanery. In the South the Negro looks to the Supreme Court for rights denied him by the state. Contradictory divorce laws in the states create a demand for national legislation. Why cater to state pride when the welfare of the people demands uniform legislation?

However, granting the ills that lead to centralization and paternalism, the cure seems worse than the disease. The cure for the ills of democracy is more democracy. If a people on their own have to face ills as did the early gold miners in California, they will find a way to overcome them. Americans are not like the Germans of Hitler's day of whom it was said, "They like to be told what to do." Here we will never like to be told

what to do, whether by a speed law or a wet-paint sign; and in this independence is our hope.

Widening censorship is another significant trend. It is extending over a wider and wider territory. Once confined to matters of morals in books, the movies, and the stage, it is reaching on to subjects dealing with race prejudice, public safety, and to limitations of criticism. Very recently the English movie of *Oliver Twist* was refused entrance to this country because of Jewish objections. The next step would be to bar the *Merchant of Venice* because of Shylock. As the censorship goes on to include inventions, discoveries about the atom, and so on, we see a definite restriction on intelligence. The thing that democracy needs for self-rule is to be cribbed and cabined by the mind and will of limited nobodies who sit in swivel chairs.

Thus the censorship that the Philadelphia ministers applauded goes on inexorably to wider areas with the final goal that people shall know and think only what authority permits. Jefferson wrote that he had "sworn before God eternal enmity against all tyranny over the human mind." Such tyranny was rearing its head when the police raided the bookstores. It is not as though there were an absolute standard. Localities differ in their sensibilities; and what one frowns upon, another permits. Logically the next step would be an Interstate Literary Commission to which there would be appointed representatives of all groups, Catholic, Protestant, Jews, citizens of South and North, freethinkers, Negroes, scientists, labor interests, and the N.A.M. Then would come an Index and a listing of sacred cows which might pasture without disturbance. Then booksellers, publishers, and the public would know what is safe.

Nevertheless, censorship seems inescapable in the complex conditions of modern society. It is evident that some things should not be published and that society needs protection from uncleanness. We do not advocate throwing open the gates to allow anyone from anywhere to travel freely through an atomic plant. Nor do we feel that the proceedings at Yalta should have had instant publicity. It is well to remember that the long conference and debate that attended the making of our own constitution were secret until the work was done. If they had not been, debate and fiery opposition would instantly have developed and the new nation would have been hopelessly divided. "Open covenants openly arrived at" sounds well, but the thing is practically impossible.

If censorship is necessary, then let it fit into the democratic process and be a rule that free people make for themselves rather than the repressive prohibition by outside authority. Such censorship would be the sign of self-discipline, a fresh token of how people can protect themselves. When a convention of druggists in Atlantic City last summer urged its

50,000 members scattered over the country to clear their shelves of all publications of a salacious and obscene nature, they represented freedom at its best. Because they are free does not mean they can do anything. In their freedom a people can ban certain ways just as a person of high moral character will not permit himself to touch an unclean thing.

Perhaps the most disappointing and dangerous trend today is the increasing emphasis on security. For those who have been educated to believe in freedom and to accept our liberties with attendant risks as the highest goal, it is a shocking thing to hear them derided by multitudes who deny their worth and set up another goal, security, as their idol of worship. Recently, the youngest member of the New Zealand Parliament, twenty-seventy-year-old W. W. Frear, as reported in *Time,* declared in Parliament that the youth of New Zealand valued security above freedom. It is a strange and disconcerting spectacle that is now afforded to the sons of liberty: the uncounted millions who are arrayed against the things democracy stands for, fighting for dictatorships that count no individual or rights as sacred.

In explanation they tell us that our liberties have been weighed in the balances and found wanting. They are ineffective and only a protection for the privileged. The poor man knows he is not free when he bargains with industry. His freedom gets him nothing, whether the authority over him is an industry or a union. His freedom is freedom to starve. He has the same right as a rich man to sleep under a bridge, but woe to him if, as a laborer, a neighbor, a voter, he gets out of step with the powers that be. He must march in lockstep with his fellows and obey the orders of his union, and if because of a depression or technological change or advancing age he loses his job, it will be too bad.

What he wants, therefore, is security, to feel safe in his job, to know his family will be provided for if anything happens to him. If an overruling power will see to this, provide social insurance for sickness and a retiring allowance, then he is in a mood to grant such a power all the authority it wants. You can have your liberty, give me security, he cries, and is happy with the exchange.

However reasonable this may sound, there is dynamite in it. Never have men gone far when they were thinking first of security. The Puritans and other pioneers made their great venture with their lives at stake. Old Jule, the indomitable farmer of Nebraska, went through a hundred privations with no thought of relief from Washington. Said the New Zealand *Herald* commenting on Frear's word,

> If youth today values security more highly than freedom, it is time to ring down the curtain on Britain's part in the human story. The *Golden Hind* could never have been sailed nor yet the *Mayflower* nor yet the *Endeavor* to map the

coasts where Frear sits in council, had the youth of vital and dynamic generations valued safety most of all. If Frear's socialism has truly won its way and youth is as he has pictured it, then the doctrines of labor have paralyzed the most precious forces of the race.

In confirmation of this we note that the nations in history that have been secure have been those nations that looked on their security as a by-product and trusted in their military and economic strength.

Winston Churchill, in his story of the war, makes a final and devastating comment on those who want peace at any price. On the flyleaf is written, "How the English-speaking peoples through their unwisdom, carelessness, and good nature allowed the wicked to rearm." Then he goes on to tell how Atlee, Oxford students, and many more, mistaking security for safety, refused to believe that wicked men were plotting against them. As a result came the most unnecessary war in history.

Not security but liberty is the first consideration. If liberties are preserved, a people will be secured; but not the reverse. If wishful thinking makes a people believe that privilege is a natural right and unearned security a mark of superiority, then they are in danger. Such security is a mark of weakness, a danger signal that they will neglect only at their peril.

IV

In conclusion we may mark criticism of our western institutions. In the interchurch meeting in Amsterdam, Joseph L. Hromádka, a theological professor of Czechoslovakia and a communist, made a devastating attack on the western nations and their ideas.

> The era of the western nations is approaching its end under the terrific storm that is sweeping through all humanity. Even the enormous wealth and the military and atomic power of the American nation must not deceive us. Anxiety about the advancing, social transformation under the leadership of the Soviet Union is depriving the average western citizen of a real grasp of the situation. What he has taken for granted is slipping through his hands and makes him confused, reckless, scared, nervous or disillusioned and apathetic. He has not much to offer along the lines of moral, philosophical leadership. His political dealings are not free from cramps.

The truth forbids us to make a hot denial of these charges, nor will we ask what a police state like the Soviet Union might have to offer on its part of moral, philosophical, or spiritual leadership to these so-called bankrupt states. Nor should we offer a *nolo contendere,* acknowledging the criticism and confessing that we have done as we ought not to have done and have left undone what we ought to have done and to be doing.

In a spirit of realism we find some comfort when we remember that this country is still young and its constitution is still in the experimental stage. Constantly we are making adjustments. It is no reason for surprise or discouragement that we have not yet reconciled the federal principle

with local liberties. At the same time we know that the freedom we seek is right and that nothing less can ever satisfy us. The highest value we know is personality. Therefore it is everlastingly right for that spirit to have liberty to realize itself. No efficiency of operation in the material world can make up for the deprivation of the dignity, values, and potentialities of the individual man.

These liberties, then, must have constant exercise. Like the mercies of God, they should be new every morning and fresh every evening. Because they belong to the growing man they cannot be finally formulated. Our constitution has to be amended because free humanity will find the old forms of liberty, the hand-me-downs of another generation, insufficient to protect them. Liberties are not mounted in some finished form like jewels in a case. They are a spirit to be used as we face the problems that added power, housing deficiency, the frictions of the races, and the industrial world have created for us.

These liberties are costly. Self-government, like establishing a home, demands constant attention. As Thomas Paine wrote, "Those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom must like men undergo the fatigue of supporting it." At times it seems that people fall down on mundane jobs like carpentering, painting, repairing our home, and bringing home the bacon. They must not go to sleep who govern themselves.

If the western idea of liberty has grown out of faith in the dignity and worth of the individual, then that faith is a critical thing and should be renewed when its light grows dim. This was Raymond Fosdick's plea in a recent article in the New York *Times,* "Not Money Alone But Faith Is Needed." The world needs a spiritual Marshal Plan, he told us. Its sickness of soul needs more than guns and machinery. Liberty is the song that America has to sing, one that goes beyond free enterprise and economic achievement. This song "is a passionate belief in freedom and the worth and dignity of human personality. There was a time when such ideas as a trumpet sounded over the world and brought the walls of kingdoms crashing down to the word of liberty, equality and fraternity."

To this, Dr. Fosdick added: "Great moral principles are rooted in great faiths. We need our version of the Puritan vision. We should not allow Soviet totalitarian philosophy to appropriate this promise of a better future and betray the greatness from which we sprang."

Here then we are on firm ground. The expressions of liberty are varied, as diverse as the environments where we were nurtured. Liberty itself is the promise of endless diversity. If the faith is kept, the faith that came from Sinai and the Sermon on the Mount, then the variations are only illustrative and incidental. In the end, the diverse tones will be harmonious and the many forms of liberty "make one music as before."

CLEAR THOUGHTS ON A COLD MORNING

EUGENE M. AUSTIN

The Baptist Temple, Charleston, West Virginia

ONE WINTER morning I came into Philadelphia on an early train. Two workmen beside me with their lunch boxes in their laps were exchanging bitter stories about their foreman; while a weary, dirty sailor sat on the arm of the seat ahead whistling aimlessly to keep awake, staring at a smouldering cigarette he was not smoking. Perhaps it was because my own spirit had drifted into a mood of tired hopelessness; but at any rate, I was affected deeply by the question of a little boy who had been pulling at my arm for a little time before I became aware of him: "Mister, would you please tell me where we are at?"

It was easy enough, of course, to answer the boy's question, for just at that moment the engineer applied the brakes and the train slowed for the North Philadelphia station. Everyone came alive; and there was even the sound of laughter at the other end of the car where some undaunted soul had mustered a joke. The doors were opened, and we left the train. But as I set out up Broad Street in search of breakfast, my mind reverted to the lad's question. Where are we, I pondered. Whence we have come, from what beginnings we have found our way—these problems have been attacked by our university men, and their research has provided us with a body of knowledge whose range has widened with the years. But how far have we come? Where are we now? As I walked along, the weight of my brief case reminded me of a book inside—a book containing the assembled addresses of a hundred philosophers and scientists who had gathered in New York to discuss this very question. I had read the book, had found it full of amazing information and arresting conclusions. Perhaps we expect too much of a book, however; and I had been disappointed. Why should not the scholars record their gropings, so long as they admit them for what they are? They all conceded that we were living through an era in human history that was freighted with possibility; and the list of discoveries was lengthy. Problems of human conduct were carefully defined; potential resources for human betterment were outlined in elaborate detail. But in the midst of it, and lurking between the lines, was the unsolved enigma—Man. With all of his resourcefulness and inventive ability, there he stands—Man—destroying his best and yet surviving; shuttling through the long, grey dawns down endless tracks of time, until at last he has come to this particular moment in eternity. And still the lad's question kept recurring in the rhythm of my walking feet,

"Would you please tell me where we are at?" (I think it was that final, ungrammatical "at" that hooked itself into my restless spirit!)

It goes almost without saying that there are many knowledgeable folk who are venturing various answers to the question. One unhappy mind surveys the human scene, as the poet Masefield did recently in *Fortune* magazine, and comes away with tortured descriptions of yawning abysses and spirals downward. As a human race, they say, we are just about at the end. Oh, to be sure, we shall survive for awhile. But survival, as such, has never been a human, but rather a subhuman animal aspiration; until now, it has been our dream of scaling new heights and creating new worlds that has constituted our glory as man. But now, with our talk of survival, of somehow salvaging something livable out of disaster, our very mind-set is typical of a species which has achieved its zenith. As a vertebrate form, we have fair enough chances to survive a few more hurricanes, ice ages, and wars; but as *man,* we have had our day and squandered it.

Cold as it was, with the wind sweeping up Broad Street and the early workers hurrying for the subway entrances, I found myself heated by my own emotional response against so sleazy an answer. It was not simply wrong; it was too facile, brittle, superficial. It would stand no pragmatic test of truth. For if there is anything about ourselves of which we can be sure, it is this—that we have only begun to discover what mankind can do and be! It is not so much the pessimism of an answer like that that irritates me, but its refusal to face fact. I recalled the babble of protesting voices that had filled our house on the previous Sunday afternoon, when some house guests returned from Old Christ Church. They had gone down to a vesper service to hear a visiting preacher from another city; and they came home disagreeing most violently with what he had said. They said he began by affirming that democracy in America was almost a phantom dream; and they agreed with him there. But he went on to declare that democracy was endangered because the people of America had lost hold of certain basic convictions without which their way of living could not possibly endure; and they waited to hear. Then came the accusation: The American people, the preacher said, had lost their conscience, their neighbor-sense, their God, their challenge. And they said, No; it isn't so!

But in the cold light of that early morning walk the sermon's clear outline got into the rhythm of my steps: lost conscience; lost neighbor; lost God; lost challenge. What if the preacher had not been just playing with hyperbole, but were rather in dead earnest! Then, I decided I should be forced to disagree with him as violently as had my friends. Not that many others are not engaging in the same kind of Cassandra cry: the

preacher would not be alone. But by the very nature of our task as ministers, we are thrown close to people; and their needs and aspirations and loyalties are the same whether they are members of his parish or mine. And I cannot see how a man can live close to the kind of people I live close to, and say that they have lost their conscience. For I have never seen such honest perplexity, such genuine, sensitive searching of heart as I have seen recently in America, both inside the church and out of it. Never in our national history has there been a more poignant fellow feeling with the Apostle than now: "The good that I would I do not; but the evil that I would not, that I do." No, if the preacher really meant it, I thought, I must disagree with him as my friends had. America has not lost her conscience, her neighbor-sense, her God, or her challenge. Bewildered, yes—terribly so; and misled often. Like Daniel Boone, who replied once when someone asked him if he had ever been lost: No, he'd never been lost; but he had been bewildered once for three days!

Enough, then, for the moment. Here was a tentative point at which to set out toward an understanding of the enigma which had struck me so forcibly in the early dawn. Man—what can we know about him? Certainly this, that all the knowledge which science has amassed, and even the tragic mistakes which he has made, all point toward some essential greatness, some individual and collective dignity that is both achievable and yet unattained. The more adequate our common life, the worse the inadequacies; the greater the number of those who have access to the good life, the more glaring are the inequities in the lives of those who are still discriminated against; the higher our standards of life and conduct, the uglier the breach. And as we begin to see an outline of what we can be, we realize that some of our old loyalties, some of our ideas long-held, so parochial, so nationalistic, so racial, so class-conceived, just will not fit the pattern of selfhood inherent in our new conception of man. What then?

The Christian faith has an answer to that question; and the sooner we accept it and build our lives upon it, the better will our prospects of greatness be. It is found in one of the most magnificent utterances in the whole New Testament, tucked away in a little document called the First Epistle of John. To me, it is one of the richest deposits of spiritual truth I have discovered anywhere; and I am convinced that it should have been placed next to the gospels, where more people might stumble upon it. The writer of these words was living in an age when nothing was more certain than that the "end of all things" was at hand. Thinking people were looking around them and seeing the gradual collapse of the Roman empire. The big cities were disintegrating from the heart out; the slaves had more culture than their masters; waves of prosperity were followed

by waves of starvation in an endless economic cycle that had gone out of control; personal morality had sunk to the lowest ebb in the history of the ancient world. And in the midst of an era that was marked by moral profligacy, political corruption, and widespread insecurity in the midst of plenty, there stood the Christian church, a despised, persecuted minority—misunderstood, driven underground into the catacombs of Rome and the salt mines of North Africa. Surely, if there were ever a band of people qualified to know human nature in all its greed and bestiality, it was the Christians of the second century. And one of them, in spite of all he knew about hot irons and chains and the endless drudgery of the Roman galley, was able to say this: "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that when he shall appear we shall be like him . . . And every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure."

Bear in mind, for one thing, that this is not a description of what we ought to be; it is a description of what we are. "We are sons of God," says John; and the very nature of our close bond to him who made us constitutes our danger and our hope.

For even the sons of God can turn their backs on him. Even his children, created in his image, can sin. And when we, with all of the strength, dignity, and nobility of soul that has been vouchsafed to us by virtue of our relationship to God our Father—when we play false to the best that is in us, or compromise with our highest standards, or refuse to obey the bidding of the voice of our Father within us, then our betrayal is the worse, because we are sons of God!

Think of the tremendous implications of this suggestion. If we are prepared to accept for ourselves this intimate, personal relationship of son to father; if John was right, and we are prepared to admit the truth of this central doctrine of the faith of a second-century Christian—then we had better take stock of the issues that are involved. Think of what it will mean to the rest of the world if we fail to make the most of our sonship.

Some of us are saying that Christianity is facing in the next ten years the hardest test in its two thousand-year career. Think of the forces that are attacking the fundamental convictions of the Christian faith. We are under fire! There are forces at work in the world today that are determined to undermine the power and witness of Jesus Christ and his disciples. I am not thinking of the terrible, divided condition of the churches, or of the growing struggle between the Catholics and the Protestants across the world. Disturbing as it is to think of these terrible divisions within the ranks of the Christian church (and who can underestimate the peril we are in, just from our own divisiveness!), I am even more disturbed as I see the gathering strength of that ghastly power

036

which is the deadly enemy of Catholics and Protestants, fundamentalists and modernists alike—irreligion, secularism, the kind of life that denies the need of God; that says religion is a burden to carry and not wings to fly with; that tells a hungry, starving world that bread, enough bread, bread enough for everybody, is all that is needed to make the world a good place to live in. There is the great enemy of God—and we are sons of God! And too many of us are playing into the hands of secularism, by giving the world the impression that being a Christian really does not make much difference; that a man can call himself a Christian and still not be inconvenienced by any of the little embarrassments which come from being different. That being a Christian really does not have anything to do with business—gracious, no!—or a man's personal morals, or the way he thinks and treats minority peoples who are trying to live decently in one's own community. Not any great difference, really; no awkwardness involved, nothing that would make a person self-conscious or conspicuous. And that is exactly what the enemies of Christianity are saying, that it does not have enough vitality in it any more for a sensible man to waste his time with it. And Christians are helping them to prove it.

No one cares to argue any more when the assertion is made that royalty, as a social and political institution, is practically a thing of the past. Personally, I am sorry; for there have been many kingly kings and queenly queens, and they have done the world much good. It is not my purpose to attempt to explain the forces that have caused the decline; but I know exactly when I first became sure that it was so. It was when Edward VIII, upon the eve of his coronation, decided that to be king of England and ruler of the British Empire was not as important to him as to spend the rest of his life with a woman from Baltimore. I may have been right or wrong; but when I heard the news I did not say, Something has happened to Edward Windsor. I said, Something has happened to the institution called royalty! For when it lost its hold upon the man in the palace, how could it hold the man in the cottage?

"Beloved, now are we the sons of God." *Noblesse oblige!* Every man has his rôle cut out for him. By some blessed destiny it has been given us to be children of the heavenly King—a destiny that we may try for a lifetime to ignore or escape (as many lost, miserable souls have tried), but never with any great happiness or success. For try as we may: sooner or later we must all acknowledge him, yield to his call, and submit our lives to his will.

Perhaps one of the most sordid, tragic stories of contemporary America is the story of the life of John Barrymore. At the turn of the century he was destined to be one of the greatest Shakespearean actors in history. His portrayal of Hamlet was an experience which no one could

ever forget who witnessed it. He died some years ago, a hopeless, debauched old alcoholic, after twenty-five years of gradual spiritual and moral disintegration. But there was one moment, back in 1940, when he achieved his old dignity and beauty—one moment; and then it was gone. It happened on a movie lot in Hollywood. They were producing a variety show, with a number of comedians doing burlesques of famous scenes from history and literature. It was a clever idea, all right, in the grotesque ways of Hollywood. Barrymore was to do one of them, and it was to be the climax of the show. He was to come out into the light and camera, a broken, drunken old actor: and he was to do a riotously funny burlesque of Hamlet's famous soliloquy. Word spread around the movie lot that it would be worth seeing; and everyone gathered on the set. Barrymore stood waiting—old, broken, and bleary-eyed. The lights went up, the cameras began to grind, the director gave the signal; and Barrymore staggered on. He struck a buffoon's grin, and began the lines:

"To be, or not to be: that is the question.
Whether 'tis nobler in the mind to suffer
The slings and arrows of outrageous fortune,
Or to take arms against a sea of troubles,
And by opposing end them."

But as Barrymore went on, a strange light came on his face. His voice grew steady, his head lifted, his shoulders came back. The crowd grew silent, and the mood changed.

"To die; to sleep;—
To sleep? Perchance to dream! Ay, there's the rub;
For in that sleep of death what dreams may come. . . ."

It was not Barrymore speaking now; it was the ancient cry of Man in all his frustration and perplexity:

"Thus conscience does make cowards of us all;
And thus the native hue of resolution
Is sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought,
And enterprises of great pith and moment
With this regard their currents turn awry,
And lose the name of action."

His voice was silent now; and after a moment's pause, he turned quietly away, and found his way through the crowd, which opened before

him without a word. Barrymore, the dissipated, broken old man had been there, willing to play the clown for another day's whiskey. But he could not burlesque Shakespeare.

"Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be." This is the greatest thing we can know about ourselves, that we are his, and that, try as we will, we cannot forever repudiate his claim upon our lives. For there is our ancient destiny and dignity, the very heart of the matter. Remove from us the sanctity inherent in our relationship to God, and we are only animals. But with our faces turned Godward, and strengthened by the conviction that his wisdom directs us, we shall find our way through this troubled moment of history and uphold the luminous tradition that has been maintained for us through two thousand years of struggle and sacrifice; and our own lives shall bear witness to the triumphant power of the Living God.

THE JEWS AND PALESTINE

S. VERNON McCASLAND
The University of Virginia

THE STRUGGLE of modern Jews to reoccupy Palestine started just before the beginning of the twentieth century, and the origin of the movement is associated with the Austrian Jew, Theodore Hertzl, who was born in 1860 and died in 1904. The two world wars interrupted this development, but after the first war Zionism immediately assumed large proportions, and as soon as the second war ended, the Jewish struggle emerged again, and this time it was more powerful than ever. As the Jews increased their pressure, the resentment of Arabs was intensified, and even before the last war much sporadic violence had occurred in Palestine; but in recent months the hostility has produced full-scale military operations, with both Jews and Arabs putting major armies into the field. The old walls of Jerusalem have been battered by siege guns, and bombs have been dropped on numerous Palestinian cities. When Britain gave up her mandate over Palestine and withdrew from the country in May 1948, the Jews proclaimed the existence of their state of Israel, and it was immediately recognized by the United States and Russia. At this point the United Nations intervened in an effort to establish peace. Thus the history of Palestine, which has been so colorful ever since its biblical story began, continues in characteristic fashion, and if we are to understand what is taking place there, we must be familiar with its past as well as with its present.

Palestine is regarded as a holy land by Arabs, Christians, and Jews. There one finds three sabbaths every week. Moslems keep Friday, Jews Saturday, and Christians Sunday. Three sets of festivals and holy days are observed throughout the year, each in turn arousing friendly or hostile emotions in different elements of the population. Religion is the most prominent feature of Palestinian life. This is notably true of Moslems and Christians and of the older elements of the Jewish population who were there before the recent large-scale migration of Zionists. Among these older Palestinians, whether Moslem, Christian, or Jewish, politics in the ordinary sense hardly exists at all. What they want to know is the religion a man professes. Yet the Moslems are divided into different factions, and so are the Jews. Small groups of Christians find themselves in a sort of no man's land, but Christian Arabs usually side with Moslems against the Jews. No political alignment has yet arisen in Palestine which could draw all these groups together as a nation, with a loyalty and patriotism embracing the entire population.

But even this confused picture oversimplifies the problem. We must not forget Britain and the place which Palestine assumed in the British Empire. Probably no one supposes that Britain exercised a mandate over Palestine merely as a disinterested referee. Nor will informed persons fail to relate the struggle in Palestine before the recent war to Italian ambition, or to the German attempt to rise again, or to the desire of the Turks to regain their lost dominions. Now all of these countries have largely receded from view, and Russia and the United States are in the foreground. We must, accordingly, view Palestine as a victim of rival imperialisms. On the other hand, the picture would not be complete if we ignored the unrest of the Near East itself. Nationalism has swept from Turkey to Southern Arabia and from Egypt to Mesopotamia. If we include the nationalism of Zionistic Jews all over the world, who hope to establish a Jewish nation in Palestine, we begin to get some conception of the complications which are disturbing the Holy Land.

Refugees versus Zionists

We should distinguish between the need of finding a home for Jewish refugees from Central Europe, and the nationalistic ambition of Zionists. No person of humane sentiments can remain untouched by the persecution of Jews during the last two decades. But millions of non-Jews have also become expatriates and homeless. The refugee problem is much more than a Jewish problem. It is one whose solution can be found only if all liberal governments coöperate in a generous way. It is true that hundreds of thousands of Jews are in need of new homes. These homes must be found, but that is not to say that they must be found in Palestine. If the only issue involved is to find homes for refugees, there is no necessary reason why Palestine should be considered. If Palestine has available space and resources, by all means let refugees go there; but let us not make the mistake of assuming that all refugees, even all Jewish refugees, must find entrance into that tiny land. Homes for refugees should be sought by a sympathetic international committee and the refugees distributed among the different nations according to their various abilities to care for them.

Zionism is a matter far different from that concerning refugees. It is a rebirth of Jewish nationalism, which has never been entirely dead since ancient times. At various times in their history the Jews have attempted to return to Palestine. Their earliest traditions tell of the tribal father, Abraham, on a trek to the Promised Land, which was Palestine. The nationalism inspired by Moses finally conquered the land and a nation was established under David about 1000 B.C., some of the native inhabitants being exterminated and others enslaved. This kingdom

was partly destroyed by the Assyrians in 721 B.C., with the fall of Samaria and the exile of its inhabitants, but finally by the Babylonians in 586 B.C., when Jerusalem fell, and the Babylonian exile began. Loyal groups among the exiles were unhappy in the foreign lands; they never forgot Jerusalem. Zionism was kept alive. They believed that some day a new prince of the royal family would restore the nation.

Under the Persians, many Jews returned to Palestine, but the nation was not to rise again until the brilliant era of the Maccabæan patriots, under whom, from 165 to 63 B.C. the Jewish state in Palestine was free again. In 63 B.C. this Jewish state was conquered by the Romans, and since that date, now more than two thousand years ago, there has been no Jewish independence in Palestine or anywhere else. During A.D. 66-70, and again during A.D. 133-135, the Jews made desperate efforts to regain their independence but were crushed by the Romans. Since that time no serious attempt had been made by the Jews to return to Palestine until the Zionist movement of our own day, but they had remembered Zion in the synagogue prayers and hoped for the Messiah. A few of the more devout from time to time through the centuries have drifted back to Jerusalem to live and die, but, even during the most terrible persecutions of the Middle Ages, no effort was made to revive a Jewish nation.

Zionism versus Judaism

The political aspect of Judaism derives from the fact that Hebrew religion in ancient times was a state religion, like other state religions of antiquity. Among the Hebrews religion and the state were bound together; they were indivisible. Loyalty to the nation was one of the cardinal elements of religion, which was associated primarily with the state and its survival. Until near the end of the Old Testament period, Hebrew religion was scarcely concerned with the survival or future existence of the individual. After the fall of the nation, the national cult devoted itself to the restoration of the nation; it became a Zionist movement, with the hope of some time returning to Zion. In the meantime, the religion, or nationalism, as we should say, set about the preservation of the people by placing a ban on intermarriage with foreigners. This took place about 400 B.C. Such a ban had not existed during the monarchy, when foreign wives were quite common. The marriage ban was a phase of the ancient Zionist movement. In Judaism the state, the religion, and the race cannot be clearly separated. The question has often been raised, whether Judaism today is a religion, a race, or a nation; and it can be answered only with reference to the individual Jew. There is a large body of Jews in the modern world who have repudiated both political Zionism and the ban on intermarriage with gentiles. For them Judaism is only a religion;

their only political loyalty is to the nation in which they live; and they have no interest in preserving racial purity by refraining from intermarriage with their neighbors.

Political Zionists see the essence of Judaism in a return to Palestine and a restoration of a Jewish nation. Indeed, a majority of the Zionists who have returned to Palestine are not only unorthodox, but are actually hostile to religion. They neither read the scriptures, attend the synagogue, nor keep the ceremonies; and they repudiate the prophetic ideals of humility, mercy, and justice. They are hard men, devoted to a philosophy and method of violence learned from Mussolini, Hitler, and the communists. The average American Christian who, out of a sympathetic feeling for his Jewish neighbors in general, gives his support to the Zionist cause, is unaware of these facts.

Many Jews who are perfectly contented in the nations where they dwell have given their support to political Zionism, but they have no intention of going to Palestine to live. They prefer life among the gentiles, where living is more prosperous. Thus they are exploiting the ancient religious conception without taking it seriously themselves. Jews of this type would tend to have a double loyalty, a kind of dual patriotism, and possibly a dual citizenship.

Zionism and Jewish Citizenship

The idea of being loyal to two flags at the same time introduces an element of ambiguity into Zionism which is capable of doing harm to Jews everywhere. The Zionists tend to identify their cause with Judaism itself. It is a commonplace for them to accuse all persons who are opposed to political Zionism of being hostile to Jews as such. Their charge is, of course, false, but their effort to identify their cause with Judaism indicates the danger to which they are subjecting Jews as a whole. If Zionists themselves so easily assume that their cause is the Jewish cause, why should they be surprised if non-Jews, who are not well informed about the different factions of Judaism, make the mistake of confusing Zionism with Judaism? This confusion will be inevitable. The agitations of the Zionists will gradually tend to cause people everywhere to feel that Jews are dissatisfied with the flags under which they live. The Zionists are likely in time to cause a question mark to be placed after the citizenship of every Jew. Their activity endangers the rights which Jews enjoy all over the world. There is no reason on this account for Jews to give up their interest in the refugee problem. But they should speak, not as Jews, and certainly not as Zionists, but as Americans, Britons, or Frenchmen, according to the nationality which they enjoy and to which they have pledged their loyalty.

Zionism and Assimilation

The very essence of a democratic state is its ability to assimilate into its life peoples of the most diverse political and national origins. That has been especially true of the United States, which now has absorbed elements from probably every racial stock, political creed, and religious faith in the world. The American law has made no test of racial purity or religious creed a basis of citizenship. It has been concerned solely with political loyalty, requiring supreme devotion to the constitution on which the nation is founded, assuming that immigrants who come to us will not only formally but actually turn their backs on the flags from which they have come and find complete satisfaction in the Stars and Stripes.

In the nature of the case, immigrants from other parts of the world bring with them cultural loyalties and even political sympathies, but by the time of the third generation the alchemy of democratic processes usually brings about an assimilation so complete that the old memories and loyalties vanish before an overwhelming pride and satisfaction in American citizenship. We are not greatly concerned ordinarily about small groups among our immigrants who sometimes devote themselves to cultivation of the cultures from which they have come, and even at times to agitation in the interest of the political system of the home country, for we believe that the unconscious processes of our democratic life will in time transform their dissatisfaction into loyalty.

It is in this light that the true nature of political Zionism appears. The majority of American Jews have been assimilated into the life of the United States and are happy in their loyal citizenship. They prove their loyalty by readiness to defend the nation with both life and property. They would not dream of returning to Germany, or Russia, or Poland, nor do they have any desire to migrate to some hypothetical Jewish state. But that is just what the Zionist agitation implies. Zionism is a loyalty to a nation other than the United States. It proceeds on the assumption that the protection of the American flag, or the British, or French, as the case may be, is not enough. Zionists cannot be fully satisfied politically unless a Jewish state rises up in Palestine, from which they will draw their inspiration and satisfaction, and to which they will yield some kind of allegiance. Zionist agitation, therefore, digs at the very roots of the one essential of American citizenship, that is, political loyalty to the nation.

The disturbing fact about the Zionist is that he is agitating for a nation that has been dead for two thousand years. It is not fair to compare Zionists with Poles or Czechs, whose nations have just been crushed. To get the perspective right, compare Zionists with ancient Babylonians, or Assyrians, or Persians, or some other people of antiquity,

whose nation existed at the time of the Hebrew nation. It is in this light that the extraordinary nature of Zionism appears. If all Americans followed the precedent of Zionism, we should begin at once to agitate for the restoration of some long-dead nation of antiquity to which we think our ancestors once belonged. Zionism is thus a principle of disintegration which strikes at the basis of all really modern nations. The Zionists are not only not assimilated politically into the nations whose citizenship they enjoy, but are determined not to allow other Jews to become assimilated. They have used their influence to ostracize and silence those Jewish leaders who oppose the Zionist nationalism and interpret Judaism as a religion without racial or political implications. They hold that such leaders are traitors to the Jewish cause. Zionism thus sets itself unalterably against the complete assimilation of Jews into the political life of the nations where they live.

The Claim to Palestine

The struggle in Palestine at the present time results from the fact that both Jews and Arabs lay claim to the Holy Land. Each of these claims ought to be considered on its merits. The Jewish case rests mainly on the fact that Palestine did belong to the Jews in ancient times. But they lost Palestine in 63 B.C. when the Romans conquered it. For two thousand years there have been very few Jews in Palestine. Even in 63 B.C. only a minority of the Jews of the world lived there. Most of them had already left the land and migrated to various parts of the world, notably to Egypt and Mesopotamia, preferring to live elsewhere then just as they do today. It is estimated that one million Jews lived in Palestine while three and a half million lived outside at that time. Since the last revolt of the Jews against Rome (A.D. 133-135), practically all Jews have lived outside of Palestine. The dominant population of Palestine during all those centuries has been non-Jewish. Moreover, Jews in the modern world have accepted citizenship in the nations where they live, thereby relinquishing presumably all other political allegiance whatever and all claims on any other nation either ancient or modern.

Zionists and Britain

Realizing that they were helpless alone, the Zionists cast about for the support of some strong modern nation, and finally succeeded in making a bargain with Britain. The British policy was formulated in the famous Balfour Declaration of November 2, 1917, which stated:

> His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.

This declaration is perhaps the greatest masterpiece of ambiguity ever formulated. It contains no less than three false assumptions: first, the idea of a national home for Jews in Palestine is anomalous as long as Jews are citizens of other countries; second, the assumption that a national home for Jews could be achieved in Palestine without prejudicing the rights of non-Jews there; third, the idea that such a national home in Palestine would not prejudice the rights of Jews in other countries. The uncanny premonition of the statesmen who formulated this weird document has been gruesomely vindicated by the series of bloody disasters in Palestine over a period of thirty years, and the end is not in sight. It should now be clear to all that the Zionists capitalized the desperate need of Britain in the first world war in order to extract this support and that Britain exploited the romantic dream of the Zionists about Palestine in order to gain the aid of Jews all over the world in defeating the Central Powers. In that crisis the Zionists committed the fate of their cause to the vagaries of the politics of Britain's imperialism. At one stroke the Zionistic dream was made dependent on the British Empire for its realization, for the interests of the Empire were carefully guarded in the vague Balfour formula. Naturally, the unrealistic and romantic Zionists assumed that Britain had guaranteed the rise of an independent Jewish state in Palestine, but it is clear that no such guarantee was given. Britain only promised to do whatever the needs of her empire should require, reserving to herself the right to determine what those needs might be.

On the basis of her pledge, Britain, under the League of Nations mandate, has admitted about five hundred thousand Jews to Palestine. But the strife which resulted forced her to the conclusion that Jewish migration must first be limited and then forbidden, except with the permission of the Arab majority, thus establishing the status of the Jews as a minority in an Arab-dominated state. This policy was announced in the white paper on Palestine published in May, 1939. Whether the needs of her empire required this decision is not for us to judge, but we may assume that neither Semitism nor anti-Semitism entered into it, for the British statesmen are not accustomed to be swayed by sentimental considerations when formulating imperial policy. Britain was probably motivated by the desire to strengthen her hold on Palestine, which was virtually the keystone in the arch of her Oriental empire, controlling the pipelines which bring the oil of Iraq to the Mediterranean and protecting the northern approach to the Suez Canal; and she apparently used the Zionists to that end.

The Arab Claims

It should not be forgotten that the native population, now nearly 1,000,000 altogether, predominantly Moslem Arab, likewise lays claim to

Palestine, and the Arab claim rests on the basis of a continuous occupation of thirteen hundred years. Caliph Omar conquered Jerusalem in A.D. 637. Palestine became a Moslem country at that time and, although the land has experienced numerous changes in sovereignty, ruled by Moslem, Crusader, Turk, or British, the basic Moslem Arab occupation has been continuous. The present native life is rooted in a tradition of thirteen centuries. It may be that the Arab is primitive and unprogressive according to Western ideas, but his culture is an old one and his land is holy to him. Islam is a daughter of Judaism and Christianity. Moslems believe in the inspiration of both Hebrew and Christian prophets, and all the shrines and holy sites of the Bible are sacred to them. The Arabs, therefore, did not take over an alien land in a religious sense when they conquered Palestine. Jerusalem and Hebron are second in sacredness only to Mecca and Medina. Those who know the Arab religion are aware that every burial ground is a sacred place, especially the tombs of outstanding persons, with a shrine by every village of Palestine today, not to mention sacred trees, rocks, springs, and other objects associated with the devotions of the people. To Jews and Christians the land is holy because of the ancient past; to Arabs it is holy also because of its sacred present.

The Arabs of Palestine and adjoining countries have been brought into increasing contact with Western influence for a generation or more and, like other peoples, have felt the lure of nationalism. They were restive under Turkish rule and so were easily drawn into the net of British diplomacy during the first world war, in much the same way, and probably for the same purpose, that Jews were. Their hopes for national freedom were fired by agents like T. E. Lawrence, and their aid was finally bought by a promise contained in a letter from Sir Henry McMahon, high commissioner of Egypt, to Hussein, the sherif of Mecca, dated October 24, 1915. The letter, which is exceeded in ambiguity only by the Balfour Declaration, promises that Britain will recognize and support Arab independence in all the territories proposed by Hussein except in certain regions in Mersina, Alexandretta, and Syria, lying west of Damascus, which are not purely Arab. Since Palestine was not specifically excepted in the letter, the Arabs, after they aided the British in driving out the Turks, have claimed that a free Palestine should belong to them. Their claim of ownership based on centuries of occupation was reinforced by victory in war and also by Britain's promise. But it looks as if the hopes of both Arabs and Jews had been exploited in the interest of the British Empire.

Arab Hospitality

The Arabs have lacked the refinements of civilization, but they are not essentially inhospitable or unfriendly. The present struggle between

Arabs and Jews has produced cruel and bloody deeds, but this cannot be attributed to any inherent or traditional hostility of Moslems toward Jews. In fact, quite the contrary is the case. Their hospitality to Jews for centuries is well known. When Jews were subjected to the cruelest persecutions at the hands of European Christians, they often found refuge with Moslems. Moorish Spain was friendly to Jews, and under that protecting rule Jews enjoyed the greatest prosperity and the highest culture that they have ever known until quite recent times. It was that period which produced Maimonides, one of the greatest Jews of the Middle Ages. When he fled from Spain, it was not from the Moors, but from his fellow Jews, for whom he was too liberal. Driven out by his own coreligionists, he found hospitality in Moslem Cairo, as court physician to the brilliant Arab sultan Saladin, who triumphed over the greatest of the crusaders in Palestine. There under the protection of the friendly Moslem court, Maimonides lived his life in peace and prosperity, wrote scholarly books, and served as rabbi for a prosperous Jewish community. For seven hundred years the Jews lived in peace with the Moslems of Spain. No similar record was ever achieved in a Christian land. On the other hand, the same hospitality was enjoyed by Jews living around Moslem Bagdad from the eighth century onward. This Moslem attitude may be compared with the ferocity of the crusaders, who classed Jews with the infidel Moslems and killed hundreds of thousands of them on their way to the Orient. When France, England, and finally Christian Spain expelled their Jews, large communities of them migrated to Moslem Egypt and Turkey, where they enjoyed peace and another period of prosperity. Nor were the Arabs of Palestine hostile to Jews before the rise of modern Zionism, when no less than thirty thousand Jews lived there with the Arabs in peace.

The hostility of modern Palestinian Arabs toward Jews is not to be explained from historical antecedents. They have been friendly to Jews in the past. But in the days of happy relationships between the two peoples Jews were satisfied to live as guests in the Arab lands. The new Zionism, however, introduces an entirely different situation. These Jews are not asking hospitality of the Arabs, but are fired with a nationalism of their own. They are determined to establish a Jewish nation. Arabs see in Zionism not only a threat to their own nationalistic hopes, but the possibility that they may even lose the entire land which has been their home for thirteen centuries. The present situation results from the clash between two flaming nationalisms, and compromise will be difficult. If the Zionists succeed, it would seem that the Arabs must either be exterminated, or exiled, or enslaved, or absorbed into the Jewish population,

eventualities which are unpleasant for the Arab to contemplate. This is the basis of his resentment against Jewish immigration.

The Capacity of Palestine

Much of the current Zionist propaganda is unrealistic with reference to the size and agricultural capacity of Palestine. The authorities credit to Palestine 10,500 square miles of land, an area about equal to the state of Maryland, but the really habitable part of Palestine is less than half that amount. Modern Palestine extends from Lebanon on the north all the way down to Akaba on the Red Sea to the south; but if one draws a line from Gaza to Beersheba and then to the south end of the Dead Sea, he will include above it all that is really able to support a population, and a good deal of that area is uninhabitable. From Beersheba southward is worthless desert, so far as habitation goes, save for infrequent Bedouin families who live on the verge of starvation. This wild country consists of rocks, sand hills, and mountains utterly barren of vegetation. The idea of making it suitable for habitation can be characterized only as a fantastic dream. The useful part of Palestine is a small territory about forty miles wide and about 120 miles long, an area of 4,800 square miles, about the size of Connecticut. Even this area is extremely poor from an agricultural point of view, save for small sections like the coastal plain and the Plain of Esdrælon. To one who is familiar with rich American farm lands, Palestine looks pitiful indeed, far worse than most of the washed-out farms which the United States Government is now trying to salvage. The forests of Palestine have been destroyed almost to the last tree, and large sections of the country are composed of hills so steep that no modern agricultural implements could be used on them, and the soil has been so wasted by centuries of erosion that often nothing remains but rocks. Great rocks are one of the most prominent aspects of Palestinian landscapes. Much of the propaganda about Palestine leaves the impression that the Zionists have made the deserts "blossom like the rose" and that now the land "flows with milk and honey." They have indeed accomplished much under great difficulties, establishing colonies, planting trees, eradicating malaria, building factories, power plants, and reconstructing a Jewish culture there; but the task of overcoming the barrenness of the land still remains to be done, and the cost and labor are great. An objective view will recognize that Palestine at best can never become the rich agricultural land of which the Zionists dream. It can support a modest population, but its resources are extremely limited.

It looks to a disinterested person as if Palestine already had as large a population as it could well support. The population today is about 1,500,000, of whom about 500,000 are Jews, about 900,000 are Arabs, and

the remainder is made up of small groups of various nationalities. Thus Palestine now has a population density of three hundred persons per square mile, if we consider the habitable area realistically. Its population density is equal to that of Connecticut and nearly twice that of Maryland. It should be obvious that this small country cannot support a large population with satisfaction. The present inhabitants live on an exceedingly low level, almost totally lacking what we regard as simple necessities of life. A limited number of Jewish colonists can be of benefit to the country, but an upper limit on the population is rigidly indicated by its meagre resources.

The Problems of the Jews

There is a nebulous idea abroad that Zionism means the return of all Jews to Palestine and, since people everywhere would be glad to see a satisfactory solution of the problems of the Jews, the movement has often been given support on that vague basis by non-Jews as well as Jews. But there is no justification for this notion. Most Jews do not desire to go to Palestine and, even if they did, the idea of adding the fifteen or sixteen million Jews of the world to the present population of Palestine is unthinkable. There are about ten times as many Jews in the world as Palestine could conceivably support. This is a fact which must be remembered in considering Jewish problems. Even in ancient times the Jews had outgrown Palestine. Arthur Ruppin, lecturer on Jewish sociology in the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, makes the following estimates of Jewish population in the world. In A.D. 70 there were about 4,500,000 Jews, of whom only 1,000,000 lived in Palestine. By A.D. 1500 the number of Jews in the world had dropped to 1,500,000; in 1800 it had grown to 2,500,000; by 1825, to 3,250,000; by 1850, to 4,750,000; by 1880, to 7,500,000; by 1900, to 10,500,000; by 1925, to 15,000,000; and in 1933 there were 16,000,000. The Jews have greatly prospered in the modern world. They long ago outgrew the resources of Palestine and they have not in the past desired to live there. Nor do they generally desire it today.

Whatever may become of Palestine, it is clear that the Jews of the world must continue to live dispersed among the various nations. Regardless of the problems involved, there is no other possibility. It is unwise for Jews to stake their happiness and well-being on the success or failure of a Jewish state in Palestine. There could not possibly be much of permanent significance to Jews as a whole in a tiny Jewish state in Palestine. The Jewish population is increasing at the rate of about one million every eight years. Every decade a new Palestine would be needed to absorb this increase. Jewish problems cannot be solved along those lines.

The state in Palestine will also be a doubtful venture from a military point of view. During a long history of three thousand years Palestine has

never had a state that could defend itself against a first-class power. It was conquered at will by Egyptians, Assyrians, Babylonians, Persians, Greeks, Romans, Arabs, Crusaders, Turks, and British. Its limited resources doomed it to be a second-rate power. That situation has not changed today. In a crisis, what reason have we to suppose that it would not go the way of Ethiopia, the Baltic states, Czechoslovakia, and Poland?

The Bible and Zionism

It is not unusual for those who advocate the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine to base their case on the teaching of the Bible. This is true not only of orthodox Jews, but also of a good many devout Christians who have espoused the Zionist cause. They point to the covenant between God and Abraham, in which Palestine was designated as the home of the Hebrew people. Then they read the predictions of Old Testament prophets that Jews dispersed over the world by the tragedies of history would some day return home. That this strain of nationalistic teaching runs through the Bible cannot be denied. No people has ever been more determined to achieve a national existence than the Jews, and that feeling of nationalism is strongly reflected in their scriptures. But beside this feeling that the true religion should be a state religion—that it should be the official religion of a Jewish nation, like the national cults of Greece and Rome—there begins even in the Old Testament a tendency toward universalism. The Second Isaiah interpreted the suffering of his people as the means God was using to bring true religion to all mankind; and the author of Jonah tried to teach his fellow countrymen that God loved foreigners just as he did the Jews. It was this widening vision of a world without any kind of racial or national exclusiveness which became the inspiration of Jesus of Nazareth. The Christian faith turned its back upon the nationalistic interpretation of religion. That is one of its most valuable insights. A good many Jews also advanced to this broader interpretation of their faith. Some of their profoundest scholars of both past and present have rejected political nationalism. They know that religion that is worth the devotion of our world cannot be based on either racialism or nationalism. As we read the Bible, whether we are Christians or Jews, it is necessary for us to recognize that there are different levels of spiritual insight in it. We can understand the nationalistic emphasis; it is intelligible in the light of Hebrew history; but it has served its time. The deeper insight of the Bible is found in the missionary vision of both Jews and Christians which recognized no national boundaries. Political Zionism, however, is an effort to revive a kind of religion which became obsolete when the state cults of antiquity died out, and it adds another flaming nationalism to the problems which already beset the modern world.

"GENTLEMEN, BE SEATED!"

ALEXANDER MACKIE
Presbyterian Ministers' Fund

"POST PRECES SEDERUNT." With these impressive words there begins the official record of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.[1] Not only does Presbyterian history in these United States so begin, but day after day it is repeated—*"Post preces sederunt."* After prayers, they sat down." After referring this and that in prayer to the Lord, they sat down. We've been sitting down ever since. But it's worse today. In those days we stood up at least when we prayed—even if the prayer lasted, as it often did, a full hour or more. It was a mighty man at prayer who could "pray the people down," although there were some who could and did.

It's worse today. We sit down when we pray. Our knees are arthritic, and we cannot kneel. And we have no backbones. So we can't stand up. We sit down. "Sanctified squatting" a choleric Methodist evangelist called it as he spoke with scorn of the prayer habits of most modern Protestants. But that's not all. Sitting down with the head substantially supported by the back of the pew in front has at least the appearance of reverence. But how about this new one, so dear to the hearts of our young homiletes, seeking after a solemnly ritualistic attitude, if haply they might find it, "Let us bow our hearts in prayer!" *O tempora! O mores!* O tripe! "Let us bow our hearts in prayer!" You don't even have to lean over and bend your tired back in reverence! Just bow your heart. It's all inside of you.

And have you ever been to one of these newfangled weddings where you stand up when the bride comes in the church and then sit down all through the service? This latter is done in obedience to a gesture made by the officiating clergyman, which gesture being translated means, "Gentlemen, be seated!" This is done because the bride's mother is tired and the visiting ladies want to see the dresses of the bridal party. If anybody is tired, it ought to be the bride. She's been hopping around from one cocktail party to another for the last three months. Why shouldn't she sit down during the ceremony and let all the people stand up? It would be something new, and, if handled right, very, very effective! And why shouldn't the poor clergyman sit down? Some of our more advanced ritualists are doing it. I saw it tried a few years ago in a Good Friday service. The reverend rector, doubtless worn out with his three-hour vigil, sat comfortably and read the lesson. It was something very, very new to me in ritual and, to say the least, thought-provoking.

[1] *Minutes,* Presbytery of Philadelphia, 1706.

But, to go back to weddings. How about this? Have the sexton take out, just before the service, all the pews in the church. This should be done in that quiet reverent way that only a sexton has, of preparing a church for a coming service. And substitute for the pews, couches with nice inner-spring mattresses! And let the guests recline on the couches. This will be much easier than standing up or sitting on a hard-backed pew. And put a smoking stand, with a pack of Camels on it, by every couch. And instead of having the bridesmaids march up the aisle in solemn stately array, put less clothes on them and let them go in and out among the couches serving cocktails and doing a little throaty singing—something about "Love is L-O-V-E," or "He's My Man," or instead of "Because," a nifty number like "Perhaps." Wouldn't that be something new and impressive for our young men to try in the way of ritual! Where, oh where do these boys in our pulpits get all this corny ritual and this neo-pious terminology?

In spite of the pious and praiseworthy origin of the practice, remind yourselves of the fact that if you sit down to pray you interfere with your ability to fight. Now, an ability and a willingness to disagree, to object, and, if need be, to fight, is a *sine qua non* of Protestantism. If you sit down to pray, you are likely to fall asleep. If you kneel, you can at least grab a gun. But if you sit, you sit. Why did our Scotch ancestors stand up when they prayed? Some say it was pure contrariness which it well may have been. Those who loved popery or prelacy knelt when they prayed. All the more reason why a Protestant Scot should stand when he prayed! But, under it all, there was the great fundamental reason—a Scotch Presbyterian, whether sleeping or waking, toiling or praying, must always be ready for a fight.

Nothing is so dangerous, so fatal to Protestantism as the silly notion that the day of moral fighting is over. Ecumenicity and concession are to win it all! Nonsense and more nonsense! The only way to get rid of wrong is to fight against it and to begin to fight as soon as it sticks up its head. Away with these twaddlers and sentimental talkers who are on both sides of the fence, these soft-headed theorists! There is only one way in which to handle wrong and that is to exterminate it.

When you sit down when you pray, you are making a splendid gesture. You have done your part! You have told the Lord about it! Now, you're through. It's the Lord's turn. Oh brother, you make me sick! Is that the kind of a man God made—one who is too lazy to fight; one who is willing to lie and say he has left it with the Lord, when he only means he has left it? You are making a splendid gesture when you sit down to pray. But you're not doing anything about it. What are you going to do about it?

If you sit down to pray, you can't see what's going on. If you open your eyes like a good Protestant while the preacher is praying, you can't see as much as if you keep them open while you're standing up. That's the reason why we have so many neoeconomists, pinks, and do-gooders in our Protestant churches. We open our eyes while the preacher is praying and we see the substantial back of the lady in front of us and we feel depressed by the fact that there are obstacles to universal love—or at least universal brotherhood. Or we see a hat—a hat with a new look—and we turn cynic and murmer, "Vanity of vanities, all is vanity." Oh! Stand up. And if you must keep your eyes open while the minister prays, repeat with the Psalmist, "I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills!"

If you sit down when you pray, you can't run away. You can't see what's coming. And you can't change your position. He is a poor man who cannot change his mind. He is a real Protestant who knows that there is neither an infallible church nor an infallible man.

Let's face this situation frankly. The thing that is wrong with American Protestantism is that it sits down too much. And we are beginning to like it. We have lost our Sunday evening service. We have lost our Wednesday night service. And we have lost our Sunday schools! And our bright young men tell us there's nothing you can do about it. The only thing we can do, they say, is to take time from the public school system and have weekday religious education. For heaven's sake, use the time you have—Sunday afternoon and Sunday evening and Wednesday night. A five-day working week—and we still can't use Sunday for church and church purposes. Give the public school back its time. Maybe the schools could teach spelling and plain good manners in the time we steal from secular education. Let's stop being stooges for the Roman Catholics in their drive against the public school system.

For over two hundred and fifty years we've had a Protestant church in what used to be a Protestant America. And we're now so tired that we have to sit down even when we pray. In spite of Madras Conferences and in spite of Amsterdam Conferences, we don't get to first base. Why, so the newspapers told us, they couldn't even have Holy Communion together at Amsterdam. What mean to our great church counselors the wistful words of Jesus, "That they all may be one"?

When the Presbyterian fathers began the *Minutes* of their ecclesiastical gatherings long ago with the words *"Post preces sederunt,"* they were, in spite of their Latin terminology, a factor in the life of the colonies on the eastern seaboard. The church had influence enough to stretch chains across the street during the hours of worship on the Sabbath day, lest worship be disturbed by the clatter of carriages and stage coaches. The church had influence enough to start and oversee all the important

educational institutions. The church had influence enough to put the fear of God into the hearts of politicians and statesmen, merchants and scientists alike. To be respectable a man had to be a churchman and listen to churchmen. And more than that—he had to be a Protestant churchman.

Compare that, please, with the status today of the Protestant clergymen and the Protestant church, especially in the colonial states on the eastern seaboard from Maine to Maryland inclusive. The Protestant clergyman ranges in status all the way from that of a sort of upper servant who is regarded as a little weak in the head, to that of a poor boob whom any white-collar man or laborer, for that matter, can, on the Sabbath, instruct, rebuke, and direct. That's among our church people.

And, in public relations, particularly at Washington, we simply don't rate at all. While the Roman Catholic Church is carrying on, with successive successful steps, its propaganda for an alliance between church and state (the church being, of course, the Italian- and Irish-dominated Roman Catholic Church), Protestants are being given the run-around. The America of Thomas Jefferson now has an ambassador at Rome, placed there by a Jeffersonian Democrat. And New Jersey, under a Republican administration, adopts a constitution providing for free bus transportation for parochial schools. And Rum and Romanism are coming into their own.

But that's not all. The struggle of the colonists of long ago was a hard battle against nature and the forces of nature. In those days the supernatural ranked high. And the transcending, the outwitting, of natural forces could well be ascribed to supernatural agencies. But as men and women, in lonely log houses on the frontiers, around the cracker barrel of the village store, in the spread-eagle debating society of long ago, talked and thought about the back-breaking struggles of the day, there began to dawn upon them the fact that Nature could be a friend if they but understood her laws. And the lightning, torn from the skies, became electricity. And the wild stream that flooded the valley and brought annual destruction was impounded and became a great reservoir of power. And the dark forest, peopled by savages and wild beasts, became the conserver of the good earth. And man learned of a Nature friendly and eager to do his will. And Nature, the enemy, was no longer an enemy but a friend. But Nature is more than a good fairy. She is a siren. And she has wooed man and won man. And the nation of Protestants, the nation of shopkeepers, now bows down to wood and stone, because there's money to be made out of Nature and the forces of Nature are supreme. Now, this way of thinking we call materialism. Far more dangerous to America than Roman Catholicism is the materialistic philosophy which makes its statesmen willing to respond to pressure groups and to be subservient to them.

But that's not all. There are those who sincerely and there are those who insincerely have sought a remedy for the decline and fall of order and equity that are the consequences of materialism. And they who have sought for a remedy for the consequences of materialism have been stupid enough to propose a remedy that is itself materialistic. And so we have communism.

What's the matter with Protestantism that it permits itself to be edged out of leadership and out of influence in American life by Romanism, materialism, and communism? Just one thing! We don't have horse sense. That means, specifically, we are more interested in words than deeds. How we thrill to talk about the great crackpot Kirkegaard, about ecumenicity, and about the "Word." How we forget that two thousand years ago "The Word" was made flesh and dwelt among us. And that summed up, the whole duty of man and of the church is this: "If ye love me, keep my commandments."

Stop thinking that when ten Protestant clergymen, distinguished or not distinguished, have signed and published a paper and ten others have signed and published a paper of absolutely different terms, anything real has been accomplished. Stop for a moment, please, your everlasting panels and discussion groups and do something about it.

In the days before the birds and the bees and the flowers came to Sunday school and taught the lesson, there were, in popular favor, certain hymns of a rather didactic nature such as every child should know. Among them were such poetic and helpful numbers as "Dropping, Dropping, Dropping, Hear the Pennies Fall." There was also "G Double O D, Good," and "It Never Pays to Be Bad; No, It Never Pays to Be Bad." Not the least of these poetic numbers was:

"We'll mind the rule in Sunday school,
We'll mind the rule in Sunday school,
We'll all sit down together."

Perhaps it is this number which is responsible for sedentary Christianity—for sitting-down Protestants.

We were just singing, "We'll All Sit Down Together." But, brother, you were only singing part of the hymn. Let's sing the other stanza:

"We'll mind the rule in Sunday school,
We'll mind the rule in Sunday school,
We'll all stand up together."

Yes, we'll all stand up together. Yes, Mr. Protestant, stand up; and when you stand up, put the emphasis on the last word ——

"We'll all stand up—*TOGETHER.*"

A CRITIQUE OF MODERN MISSIONS

JOHN K. SHRYOCK
Grace Church and the Incarnation, Philadelphia

THE HISTORY of religion shows that there have been, at times, great efforts for the expansion of various religions, such as the spread of Buddhism which began with Asoka, the conversion of the Mediterranean world by Christianity under the Roman empire, the missionary efforts of Islam, and the attempts of the Nestorians. Yet it is safe to say that history shows nothing comparable to the expansion of Christianity in the modern period, and particularly during the last 150 years, either in the area covered, or in the magnitude of the effort.

Until recently, the world of scholarship has not been much interested in this cultural and historical phenomenon. It was too close to permit of the objective attitude characteristic of good scholarship; an enormous mass of historical material had not been sifted and correlated; and worst of all, the scholars familiar with foreign mission fields—the linguists, ethnologists, and historians—disliked and distrusted the manner in which Christian missions had been presented at home and practiced in foreign lands. These scholars were interested in the cultures of the areas invaded by the missionaries, and they were aware that the missionary effort tended to destroy those cultures, and they resented the fact that many missionaries remained relatively ignorant of the cultures of the peoples among whom they labored.

This attitude on the part of scholars has been a mistake, for the modern development of Christian missions is a significant fact in the history of the race, and particularly in the history of religion. While it is too soon to make final judgments, it is not too soon to begin the scientific collection and study of material, and to make preliminary judgments on the effect of certain policies on the tremendous efforts at the expansion of Christianity. A splendid start has been made by Professor Latourette,[1] but much more work, particularly in evaluation, remains to be done. One has only to think of the paucity of material on the native reaction to Christian missions, and particularly of the reactions of the non-Christian natives, for most of the material at present available to the student of missions is Christian propaganda.

There is nothing in itself sinful about Christian propaganda; indeed, such propaganda is inevitable, and without it, the church would cease to be Christian. But there is also need for the objective study of Christian missions from the point of view of the diffusion of culture, and it is the

[1] K. S. Latourette, *A History of the Expansion of Christianity*, 7 vols., Harper, 1937-1945.

purpose of this paper to make a few suggestions toward the development of such a study, as well as criticisms of the effectiveness of modern methods.

There are certain assets and liabilities of missions which are not peculiar to the modern period. While there have been failures among the missionaries of all ages, it is also true that the devotion and heroism of modern missionaries is probably as great as at any time in the past, needing only the occasion to be manifested. There have always been rice-Christians, but it is probable that there are not so many of them in mission lands today as there were in the Roman empire shortly after Constantine embraced Christianity. Doubtless there are converts who have not been properly prepared for baptism, and for whom the acceptance of Christianity does not mean a changed life, but the probabilities are that the percentage of such men is not as high as in the converted army of Clovis.

There are certain generalizations on the diffusion of culture which apply to religion at all times. When two cultures come into contact, one of which is highly developed, while the other is relatively primitive, the group having the primitive culture will more easily adopt the higher culture, including religion; and this is particularly true when one religion has a well-developed theology, while the other has not. For this reason it was relatively easy for Christian missionaries from the Roman empire to convert the Teutonic tribes.

But when two religions come in contact, both of which have well-developed theologies, any progress in conversion will be slow and difficult. This is shown by the history of the contacts between the major religions, such as Christianity, Judaism, Islam, and Buddhism. In the case of the Roman empire at the beginning of our era, since the general level of culture was high, but religion was bankrupt, the Romans borrowed religions from the Orient, yet did not borrow such cultural features as law and engineering. These statements illustrate the general laws of cultural diffusion which operate at all times in the sphere of religion.

There come, from time to time, moments when the missionary opportunity is much greater than at others, usually because of the operation of cultural laws. Such a moment coincided with the founding of Christianity, when Greek culture, Roman law and order, the use of one or two widely spread languages, and relative ease of communication, combined with the excellency of Jewish and Christian religion in the midst of the degeneracy of Roman and Greek faiths, to give an unusual opportunity for the propagation of religion. Other religions besides Christianity attempted to make use of this opening but, for one reason or another, failed—the Jews, for example, being too narrow in their extreme nationalism.

Such favorable moments last only for a limited time. The early Christians were given several centuries, but a thousand years later, when the Mongol empire offered a similar opportunity for diffusion, the Christians had only about a century in which to act, and failed to make adequate use of their chance. There were no men like St. Paul in Rome when the ambassadors of the Great Khan arrived.

There are also periods which are unfavorable to missionary effort, such as the age following the disintegration of the Mongol empire, when, for a considerable length of time, Asia was divided among extremely nationalistic countries, all abhorring foreigners and international intercourse. There are other factors entering such a situation, such as the political relations between states, or the traditional hatred caused by such mistakes as the Crusades, or the presence of an anti-Christian theology like that of Islam.

The modern period of intense missionary activity by the church coincided with other historical and cultural factors. Among them were the diffusion to Western Europe of such oriental inventions as the compass, printing, and gunpowder, the search for a sea route to the countries of Eastern Asia, the discovery of the New World, and the scientific development that followed the use of the inductive method, controlled observation, and the artificial experiment. These factors, combined with the expansion of western civilization which began in the sixteenth century, contributed to the diffusion of religion. From the time of the favor shown the early Jesuits at the court of Peking because of their scientific attainments, it has been impossible to isolate missions from politics, religion from other features of culture, or the spread of the gospel from the spread of western civilization.

The degree to which the obstacles raised by time and space have been eliminated by science has been an aid to missions. Journeys which formerly took years can now be made in days, while areas which formerly were inaccessible can now be reached easily. We can now go from New York to China in about the time it took to reach Philadelphia a century ago, while messages cross the Pacific in less time than it takes a commuter to go to his office. Conferences on religion can be attended by delegates from every quarter of the globe, and routine directions are delivered across continents every day.

Yet cultural differences are not easily removed, and the diminution of space may have raised more problems than it has solved. When St. Paul took his missionary journeys, he was not faced with a different culture at every stopping place, for the people in Rome and Athens lived very much as the people of Jerusalem and Antioch. Today, for good or ill, we are obliged to try to understand the people of Russia and China

and Indonesia, whose culture is so different from ours that we are finding the task almost impossible.

Although they were not trained, scientific observers, the early missionaries of the modern period devoted a large amount of time to the study of native cultures, and especially to the language and literature of the group among whom they were working. Perhaps this was not altogether from choice, because the early missionaries found little else they could do; but whatever the reason, these early men did produce great scholars to whom we owe a considerable debt.

It might be supposed that as time went on, and material accumulated, scholarship would improve, but the opposite has occurred, and today there are, for example, no missionaries in China of the stature of Legge, Mateer, and Schereschewsky. Young men arriving on the mission field find more work than they can do almost from the moment they arrive, and have no time for the careful, painstaking study of their predecessors.

A missionary leaves his home, takes a long journey, and lives among a strange people, because he feels that he has a message which he must deliver because of its importance. This message concerns religion not only in its subjective aspect of a man's relations with God, but in an objective aspect as a part of the culture pattern. While the former is much more important, the latter may not be neglected except at the risk of endangering the whole enterprise.

The missionary does not take his message to people who have blank minds, for those to whom he ministers already have patterns of thought which will be quite different from his own in some ways. He cannot deliver his message effectively unless he knows something of what is already in the minds of his hearers; or in other words, the more thoroughly a missionary knows the culture of his people, the better. An effective missionary will know and love the culture of his adopted country, for without both knowledge and love he will fail in his own attempt at the diffusion of culture.

When two cultures come into contact, both will be affected to some degree. Each tends to borrow from the other, features of culture which are an improvement on what it had already; but such an improvement is more obvious, and more easily adopted, in the physical aspects of culture. For example: an invention like printing, or a custom like the use of tobacco, will rapidly spread over the world; but a nation will keep its old form of social organization in spite of considerable pressure.

The features of culture borrowed by a group must be homogeneous with its existing culture pattern. The Chinese, for example, would never have borrowed the custom of dueling from the West, because it would have been contrary to Chinese ideas of settling disputes. It is practically

impossible to persuade them to drink milk, although they have been in contact with the milk-drinking peoples of Mongolia from the earliest times. On the other hand, the Chinese did adopt the horse from the peoples of Mongolia, and the chicken from the Miao peoples of the south, because these were improvements which fitted into their culture pattern.

If we conceive two separate cultures as circles, then a contact between them will cause the circles to overlap, but never to coincide. That is: each will borrow certain features from the other, modifying its own pattern in the process, and each will reject certain features of the other, retaining that portion of its own pattern. The segment overlapped will be common to both, while the outlying segments will not.

These laws apply to religion, as well as to other features of culture. Missionaries go to a foreign land and attempt to make its people Christian, but in doing this, they are obliged to change, to some extent, the culture of that country. Unless they make some change in the indigenous culture, they have failed completely; but, on the other hand, they cannot hope to change it entirely. Some things they can change, while others they cannot, and they must learn as quickly as possible which are which.

When a missionary sets out, he should already know which features of his own culture complex are essential, and which are not; which features must be retained for the preservation of the faith, and which may be compromised or dropped without endangering that faith. He should know that he cannot make the Chinese into Americans—nor is it necessary in order to make them Christians.

In certain matters, the distinction between essentials and nonessentials is clear and obvious. Such doctrines as the Incarnation and the Atonement would be considered essential, and they could not be compromised or dropped without destroying the peculiar contents of the Christian religion. On the other hand, many features of discipline or cult may be changed without danger to the faith, and no one would claim that it is necessary for clergy and choirs to wear white vestments in China, where white is associated chiefly with mourning and funerals.

There are, however, missionaries who feel that a convert must adopt an entirely new culture, and that it is a mistake to compromise even on the minor details of discipline. Religious buildings have been duplicates of similar buildings in the west, western styles of clothing must supersede those of the natives, and western customs should take the place of native ways. Sometimes moral reasons are given for such demands, as when the meagre costumes of Polynesia were condemned as improper, and converts required to wear western clothes, which were far less appropriate under the circumstances.

Such a policy cannot succeed, because the culture pattern of a group

cannot be completely altered except by the extinction of the group; and it is exceedingly dangerous, because it takes a long time for new features of culture to take root, while missionaries may find that old standards of behavior have been given up before new ones have acquired sufficient strength.

The inhabitants of the Tobriand Islands possessed rules governing the relations between the sexes which were very different from those in force in western culture, and which were condemned as immoral by missionaries. Converts were required to abandon their native sanctions and adopt those of the West; but it has been reported that instead of an improved morality, there has been, as a result of the elimination of the old standards, behavior that would be condemned in both groups.

The problem facing the missionary is this. His purpose is to diffuse that portion of the culture pattern of his own group which is called religion, and he should realize that he cannot transform the entire culture complex of the group to which he is sent. Some features of his own culture will not be adopted, and some features of the native culture will be retained.

The missionary, if he is to be successful, must see that those features of his religion which are essential to the faith are taken over by the native culture; and he must see that those features of the native culture which contradict and oppose the teaching of his religion are dropped. To return to the illustration of the two circles: the missionary must so conduct his propaganda that all the essentials of his faith are included in the overlapping segment, while all features of the native culture which would destroy that faith remain outside. He may, if it is advisable, compromise any feature of his culture which is not essential to his religion.

Missionaries, and religious people generally, may object to this analysis of missionary work. They may feel that the primary work of the missionary is the spread of the gospel, not the diffusion of general culture, and in this they would be correct. Religion is concerned with the will, rather than with the intellect; while it is possible for a savage who can neither read nor write to be a better Christian than a university professor. Yet in a critique of modern missions it is necessary to make such an analysis, because of the peculiar characteristics of the modern missionary enterprise; and this becomes clear if we compare the intentions of a modern missionary with those of the missionaries of past generations.

When St. Paul journeyed about the Roman empire, he had a single purpose, which was to preach the faith of Christ crucified. He did not go to Corinth with the idea that he would spend any part of his time teaching the Corinthians how to make bigger and better tents. In converting the gentiles, he repudiated the idea that a gentile must accept the entire Jewish-Christian culture complex in order to become a Christian,

and such an idea as converting the Corinthians to any feature of culture except religion would never have occurred to him.

This is true of most missionaries of the ancient and mediæval periods. The obscure Christians who conquered the Roman empire, the missionary saints who converted the Celts and the Teutons and the Slavs—these, and others, had a far clearer grasp of the essentials of successful missionary effort than the men of our era. St. Paul and St. Francis found the burden of preaching Christ heavy enough without adding anything to it.

It is, however, the peculiar characteristic of modern missionary effort that in addition to the spread of the gospel it has taken the responsibility of diffusing western civilization. Modern missionaries do not simply preach the faith; they teach a multitude of secular subjects in the schools they have founded, chiefly because those subjects are taught in the schools of the lands from which they come. They have built complete systems of secular education, from the kindergarten to the university, in which religion is secondary to general western culture, with native culture a poor third. They have founded hospitals and medical schools, and they give instruction in farming and agriculture. They develop coöperative associations and all the various forms of social service, while even their evangelistic work is organized in the same manner as the work in their home lands. The value of their schools to the natives is not the religion but the modern science and the western languages that are taught in them.

The missionaries have assumed this responsibility of spreading western civilization for two reasons which are easily understood. The missionaries have felt that western culture was primarily Christian, and the fruit of two thousand years of Christian progress. They believed it to be an improvement upon the culture of non-Christian lands, and they conceived it to be their duty to carry to non-Christians, not only religion, but other features of their own civilization.

The modern period of missionary effort also coincided with the devolopment of science, and, after a time of indifference, the non-Christian peoples became eager to acquire western scientific knowledge. Since this could best be done in the missionary schools, and by contact with Americans and Europeans, an unusual opportunity was offered to missionaries. It is difficult to condemn this policy, because it has such obvious advantages. Why should Hindus and Japanese be obliged to wait for centuries, perhaps, for the results of medical progress, when missionaries are ready and willing to erect hospitals staffed with western-trained physicians and nurses? The West has developed a medical science which the East lacks, and which it is the Christian duty of westerners to take to the East as rapidly as possible.

Medicine is probably the most forceful and indisputable instance of

the good features of western civilization brought in as part of the modern missionary complex, but similar arguments can be used to cover nearly everything in European and American culture. A popular evangelist toured China a few years ago, and is reported to have appealed in this fashion: "You see that China is weak, while the West is strong. How did the West get its railroads, its automobiles, and its battleships? Christianity!" Most of us would think this a little strong; but it does illustrate how and why the missionaries have taken over the added burden of western civilization. They did this, partly in the honest belief that they were aiding the natives, and partly because the spectacular success of western science could be used to attract natives into missionary institutions.

It is time, however, for those who plan the missionary enterprise to examine this holy alliance between the propagation of the gospel and the diffusion of western culture, for it may be that the dangers which follow this policy will outweigh the benefits to the Christian cause.

The most serious danger will not worry the majority of western Christians very much. It is, that false standards of missionary achievement will be accepted by the church. How real this danger is can be seen from the numbers of Christians—not to mention non-Christians—in the homelands, who justify the missionary effort and measure its success by cultural grounds alone. Are missions a success? Certainly, we are told, because they have established hospitals and schools, and have brought to distant peoples the advantages of western civilization. Look at the wonderful buildings which have been erected in Tokyo, and Peiping, and other cities! St. Paul certainly had no such achievements to his credit, and if we accept such a standard, then the value of his work in Ephesus did not compare with that of the priests of Diana.

Another danger of our policy is that we have put off indefinitely the complete independence of native churches by building institutions, and by developing the work in such a way that those churches cannot become self-supporting for a long time. The mission stations established by St. Paul sent contributions to the mother church in Jerusalem a short time after they were founded; but our modern missions must continue to depend on foreign help, because the support of the work we have established is beyond their capacity. It makes little difference whether native clergy are in official positions of leadership, for real power is in the hands of those who control the strings of the purse, and a church which is not self-supporting cannot be independent.

Still another danger is that the alliance between Christianity and western civilization can only be temporary at the best. We have been passing through a period when the tendency in mission lands has been to accept everything foreign at its face value, but this period is already

nearing its close. Many features of western culture will be rejected by the peoples of eastern lands, and the more closely Christianity has been connected with western culture, the more unfavorable will be the reaction toward it. Already there are nations in which a close connection between a native church and America is a handicap rather than an advantage.

Moreover, we are painfully aware that not all western civilization is Christian, and that there are certain features of our culture which are actually anti-Christian. We have been unable, as yet, to eliminate these things, and missionaries should not do anything that would give the peoples of mission lands the impression that we approve of them. Can the atomic bomb be regarded as a Christian triumph? Our science, which we have exploited for missionary purposes, can be used for evil as easily as it can for good. It is also a serious disadvantage that because of our deliberate policy our missionaries represent not only their religion but their country. This may be an advantage as long as the governments of the countries are allies, but the moment the policy of the American government, for example, runs counter to popular feeling in a mission land, then American missionaries and their work will suffer because of it.

Let us imagine a situation which is not altogether imaginary. A majority of the Chinese have always been farmers, and these farmers have been so desperately poor that they have been in debt to landlords and moneylenders from the time they were born until they died. During the long war with Japan these conditions were actually alleviated because the landlords and moneylenders ran away and were unable to collect their interest. It is not difficult to understand that the old conditions cannot be restored without civil war. If a choice is offered to the Chinese between two possible governments, one of which seeks to reëstablish the former conditions of near-slavery for the common people, while the other appears to offer relief from such conditions, the choice of the majority will not be difficult to determine.

Let us further imagine that the government of the United States, for what may be excellent reasons of its own, openly and directly allies itself with the reactionary Chinese party, furnishing it with funds and war material. It is not difficult to foresee that the Christian effort in China, directed and supported by Americans, will suffer because of its connection, real or fancied, with the American government. It is only necessary to add that the policy of the missionaries in sponsoring western culture unquestionably causes many Chinese to feel that there is such a connection. In this situation, those who plan and direct missionary activities are not always well-informed with regard to the reactions of non-Christian leaders in mission lands. They may not realize that the objections of such leaders possibly have some foundation in facts, and particularly in the fact that

missionary efforts have been so closely related to western culture in general. Missionary literature is not always accurate or fair with regard to opponents.

Let us use our imaginations again. Suppose that missionaries in China have developed a complete system of secular education, which, until recently, was entirely under the control of the missionaries, and in which Chinese educators had little or nothing to say. The chief appeal of such a system of education would lie in the efficiency with which western civilization was taught, rather than in the religion which was hardly more than a by-product, and certainly not in the meagre and unsatisfactory education in Chinese culture which these foreign schools offered. If there is opposition to such schools in China, in spite of the crowds of students who attend them, the missionary leaders should carefully distinguish from whom the opposition comes, and why. It is not enough to consider all opposition as inspired by the devil, and it might be possible to show that the leaders of Chinese education who criticize the mission schools are not always opposed to Christianity as such, but rather to a foreign control which tends to submerge Chinese culture in that of the West.

These are serious matters, which will affect the future of the Christian church, and it would be well for the leaders of missions to give attention to them. It may be that the Christian missionaries of earlier ages were wiser than we have been, with our pride in the achievements of our civilization. It is too early to arrive at final judgments, but it is not too early to prepare for them.

There is no necessary and inescapable connection between religion and culture, for religion is concerned with the will; hence there may be good men at any level of culture. Nevertheless, culture is so important that a good man will consider it his duty to raise the cultural standards of others. Christian missionaries have done this for a long time—at least as far back as Ulfilas—and the church has a long list of cultural improvements to its credit, particularly during the Middle Ages.

Yet at no time in its history has Christianity been so closely connected with civilization in general as during the modern period. This has been due to a combination of forces, which include the development of science and the political expansion of the countries of Western Europe. Over the world have gone the merchants, the soldiers, the ideas, and the religion of those countries, in a surge of diffusion such as the world has never before seen.

It was natural, and perhaps inevitable, that the missionaries of religion should also have been missionaries of civilization. For a little while, they faced an opportunity that was unique, and during the time that eastern peoples were eager to acquire everything western, the alliance of religion

with general culture was of great advantage to religion. It appears, however, that a new period has begun—a period that may involve the collapse of civilization as we know it. Virulent nationalism, which contradicts the teaching of Christianity, is the determining force in politics; and should this condition prevail much longer, our command of nature gained through science will be our chief danger.

In this period which is before us, the Frankenstein of science may run amok, while the competition of nations will be heightened by competition of cultures. It may no longer be an advantage to religion to be connected with civilization, or for a Christian missionary in the Orient to be known as an American. The emphasis in mission lands may shift from those features of culture which are to be accepted, to those which are to be rejected.

Is it inevitable in the situations which will arise within the next century that the bond between Christianity and western civilization will be fatal to the former? No more than the bond between the church and the Roman empire affected the church when the empire collapsed.

But it is apparent that the missionary policy of the church should be altered in certain directions; partly in the disassociation of religion from culture in general, and particularly from nationalism. The church should not send missionaries who are Americans first and Christians afterwards, if it wishes to spread religion; nor has the church done a good thing if it puts the diffusion of culture before the diffusion of religion. These things have not been done officially, but they have been done in practice.

The mistakes due to the connection between missions and civilization should be corrected as quickly as possible. If the church may be compared to a ship, we can say that a gale is approaching—a hurricane—and the ship must not be caught with its decks cumbered with debris and all its sails set for a gentle breeze. One step in particular must be taken at the earliest possible moment: the native churches in mission lands must be made independent both in government and in finance, even though that may mean the abandonment of certain efforts at the diffusion of culture through such institutions as schools and hospitals.

The missionary achievements of the modern period are immense, and we may believe that in certain directions they will be permanent. They have been aided by the connection between religion and general culture throughout this period, but it may be that in the near future this connection should be broken. At least the leaders of missionary endeavor should reëxamine their policies in the light of what may reasonably be expected.

Where Ignorance Is Bliss, 'Tis Folly

THERE ARE few words more haunting and chastening than those which stand as the climax of the Farewell Prayer: ". . . that they may all be one." They stand, in the eyes of many, as an ageless indictment of Christianity, or, perhaps better said, of Christian people. It would be pointless to repeat in detail the charge so frequently made, both within and without the ranks of the Christian church, of the shocking disregard of this fundamental requirement: the gulf between Catholics and Protestants, and, probably in most Protestant eyes even more fatal, the almost endless divisions and subdivisions in the latter group. Here is to be found, it is constantly asserted, the real source of weakness of the church; here is the scandal which surpasses all other scandals.

And there would probably be few thinking men and women who would not agree. The problem does not lie in the diagnosis of the case but in the proper remedial procedure, and precisely because there is such universal agreement as to the propriety of this perennial challenge. Each group is convinced that all should be one, but—and this is the real difficulty—each group is so stoutly convinced that it is the one. It is easy for Protestants to point to the unbending and seemingly so arrogant position of Roman Catholicism, we are THE CHURCH, from which all others have broken away; and to cite that as the especial stumbling block to the achievement of unity. But easy diagnoses of difficulties—especially when the source of the difficulty is diagnosed as lying outside ourselves—are apt to be a bit too easy. So here. My impression is that it is the firm conviction on the part of the majority of people making up the several denominations that their especial circumstance—be it polity, theology, attitude towards the New Testament, or something else to them equally important—is the one divinely intended and ordained, and that for it and its propagation they are charged with an obligation from on high. Certainly the titles chosen by some of the admittedly smaller but amazingly zealous bodies would seem to warrant that assumption. And it would not be difficult to cite apparently valid evidence from the denominations older in years and grown more staid in their ways.

The fact must be faced and reckoned with. An active church will, of necessity, be a divided church. When men feel deeply and acutely the need for communion with God and believe that at least in part they have discovered how this is to be achieved—especially if they believe that this discovery is due to revelation from on high—they will not unnaturally be most reluctant to alter the divine pattern. As has been well said: "Vital religion is, after all, a great experiment, and each man resolves to try his own methods." Uniformity, even unanimity, would thus seem to be likely only after the funeral sermon over religion has been preached.

Thus while the ideal of "one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all" need not be regarded as either visionary or illusory, but as the soberest common sense, and its violation an unpardonable

effrontery, it by no means implies as either axiom or corollary what is easily styled "corporate union." All attempts to break down mutual hostility and suspicion, hatred and rancor—all of them largely due to ignorance —are to be hailed and supported in deed as well as in word. Thus every encouragement to fellowship and understanding, be it between local congregations or at world conferences, which tends to lessen prejudices and to make clear that other people are honest too, with similar dreams and hopes and longings, is a step ahead. But the charm of life and religion—and the two certainly are very closely entwined—would seem to be diversity. There are legitimate differences in taste, and they are not all due to cultivation. A world of uniformity, be it of dress, of food, of profession, of politics, of religion, would, after all, be a drab and sorry world. There are people who are very fond of pigs' knuckles and sauerkraut and who detest meat loaf; there are others whose taste is for precisely the reverse. It would seem to be folly to force upon either the diet delighted in by the other; it would be still more intolerable were the two foodstuffs to be combined into one dish which would likely seem detestable to both. The sensible procedure would seem to be for each to realize that the other may well be a very estimable person, and that cordial and undisturbed friendship is quite possible, without the slightest violation of dietary likes and dislikes.

Recently a central-city Baptist church suffered a disastrous fire. It meant for months cessation of activities in the damaged structure. What was the result? Before the fire apparatus had departed, churches of other denominations and faiths were offering the use of their resources. That congregation is now holding its morning service in the meetinghouse of a Presbyterian church, its vesper service in a near-by Methodist church, its all-day Wednesday meetings in the parish house of the Unitarian church, with its social service work busily under way and housed in the buildings of other communions ranging from Episcopal to Salvation Army. And cordial and wholehearted offers had come from many others, including Lutherans and Jews. More than that, there has been a stream of communications, many with entirely unsolicited financial enclosures, from folk in the many communions, ranging from Roman Catholic to Christian Scientist, and from folk in none at all. To members of that stricken church this has been a very impressive experience, and, it may be hazarded, one which has convinced them that the petition, "that they may be one," is far from being the fanciful dream of a visionary. There may have been some who a few months ago might have been a bit censorious of the dubious and nonbaptistic theology and polity of these other communions. That is past, and it is likely to be a dead past. This Baptist church is dreaming of a speedy return to the old and familiar corner, with its own particular witness unimpaired; but it will return with a very vivid sense of the goodness and devotion of other folk in other communions and able with increased insight and conviction to sing the gospel song:

> You go to your church, and I'll go to mine,
> But let's walk along together.

Behind this little vignette from life may well glimmer the sort of union that is vital and natural and possible to genuine religion.

From Off the Campus and On

THE NAME, Arthur Baldwin, is an honored one throughout the Baptist fellowship. Ordained to the Baptist ministry nearly fifty years ago, he has held several notable pastorates. Since 1919 he has been minister of the Chestnut Street Baptist Church, Philadelphia. He is a graduate of Denison University and of Rochester Theological Seminary. In 1916 Denison honored him with a D.D. In addition to his work in the pastorate he has been active in denominational circles, served overseas with the Army Y.M.C.A. during the first world war, and was for several years president of the Baptist Institute for Christian Workers. Among his writings is the volume, *Inevitable Dawn.*

Dr. Austin is the minister of the Baptist Temple, Charleston, W. Va. He had formerly held pastorates in Canandaigua and Philadelphia. He is a graduate of Georgetown College, from which institution he recently received a doctorate in divinity, and of Crozer, of which he is also a trustee. He subsequently took graduate work in the University of Pennsylvania resulting in a Ph.D. in philosophy.

Dr. McCasland is professor of religion at the University of Virginia. Before going to Virginia a decade ago, he had been for eleven years professor of religion at Goucher College. He did his graduate work at Chicago (Ph.D.) and in Germany. He was annual professor at the American School of Oriental Research, in Jerusalem, 1937-1938. He has frequently contributed book reviews to CROZER QUARTERLY. It is a distinct pleasure to be able to publish his present candid and judicious article upon a topic likely to be of interest to all.

Any paper from the pen of Dr. Alexander Mackie is worth reading and rereading. A devastating foe of bunk and pretense, he can deflate ostentatious pomposity, especially when it is couched in what passes for the language of Zion, in a way that is easy to take but not to forget. He is a graduate of Princeton—both the University and the Theological Seminary. For twenty-five years he was minister of the Tully Memorial Presbyterian Church, Sharon Hill, Pa. Since 1936 he has been president of the Presbyterian Ministers' Fund and a devoted friend and good angel of many an underpaid and hard-pressed minister.

Dr. Shryock is Philadelphia born and Philadelphia bred, holding three degrees (B.S., A.M., and Ph.D.) from the University of Pennsylvania, where he subsequently taught Chinese and anthropology for several years. For ten years he was a missionary in China, at St. Paul's School, Anking. He is an Episcopalian and is at present rector of Grace Church and the Incarnation. He is the author of four books and has written many articles and reviews, several of which have appeared in these pages.

In answer to the persistent requests for more book reviews we are devoting nearly half this issue to this important service. No less than forty-five books by thirty-nine reviewers is, we submit, a new record even for Crozer Quarterly. And we are confident that our readers will not think that quality has been sacrificed to quantity. Dr. Abrams is a professor of sociology at the University of Pennsylvania. Dr. Adams is minister of the First Baptist Church, Richmond, Va. Dr. Alley is editor of the *Religious Herald,* published in the same city. Dr. Aubrey is president of Crozer. Professor Bond is head of the department of religion at Bucknell. Dr. Braden is professor of the history and literature of religion at Northwestern University. Dr. Brightman is professor of philosophy at Boston University. Professor Brush has the chair of church history at Andover Newton. Dr. Cooper is professor of old Testament at the Lutheran Theological Seminary (Philadelphia). Professor Cranston, formerly at Dartmouth, has recently joined the faculty of the University of Southern California. Mr. Enslin lives on Cape Cod and is dividing his time between farming and writing. Dr. Franklin is president *emeritus* of Crozer and a former foreign secretary of the A.B.F.M.S. Dr. Fries is associate professor of philosophy at the University of Wisconsin. Mr. Gehr is minister of the Universalist Church of the Restoration, Philadelphia. Professor Grant is on the theological faculty of the University of the South. Dr. Grey is minister of the First Congregational Church, Woburn, Mass. Professor Hadas is a member of the department of Greek and Latin at Columbia. Dr. Harkness is professor of church history at Crozer. Dr. Hart is Episcopal bishop of Philadelphia. Dr. Holloway is a member of the faculty of Denison University. Mr. Ivey is minister of the Second Baptist Church, Richmond, Va. Mr. Keighton is professor of preaching and worship at Crozer. Dr. Matthew is professor *emeritus* of Old Testament at Crozer. Professor Mould has the chair of Bible at Elmira College. Professor Orlinsky is a member of the department of Bible at the Jewish Institute of Religion, New York. Dr. Parsons is professor *emeritus* of New Testament at Colgate-Rochester. Dr. Pfeiffer is head of the department of Old Testament at Harvard. Mr. Schmoyer is minister of St. Paul's Reformed Church, Kutztown, Pa. Dr. Skoss is professor of Arabic at Dropsie College. Dr. Smith, now retired, was for many years minister of the Ardmore (Pa.) Baptist Church and prominent in denominational affairs. Mr. Starr is librarian of Crozer Theological Seminary. Dr. Vaughan is professor *emeritus* of theology at Andover Newton and has just retired again, this time from a pastorate in Florida. Dr. White is professor of religion at Defiance College. Dr. Widgery is professor of philosophy at Duke. Dr. Williams is associate professor of theology at Chicago Theological Seminary. Dr. Willkens is professor of religious education at Colgate-Rochester. Dr. Wilson is dean of students at Lincoln University. Professor Wolfe is Harkness professor of biblical literature at Western Reserve University. Dr. Wright is professor *emeritus* of philosophy at Dartmouth. Surely this is a list of reviewers of whom any theological journal might well be proud.

BOOK REVIEWS

Can Protestantism Win America? by Charles Clayton Morrison, New York, Harper, ©1948, pp. viii, 225, $2.50.

Here is a book every Protestant should read. It has the realism of intimate and objective knowledge, the drive of conviction, the depth of insight, and the power of courage. Because of the very confusion in Protestantism to which it points, it is hard to forecast what reception the book will get. Many laymen, tired of the pettiness of sectarian rivalries, will welcome the frankness of the volume. Clergymen will be annoyed and possibly aroused by it, but they will feel discouraged by the stranglehold of denominational ecclesiastics, and the inertia of the mass of church members.

Dr. Morrison, who has given his life to the cause of Protestant coöperation, sees some progress, but he raises seriously the question whether it is proving too little and too late. Protestantism he finds in a race with Roman Catholicism and secularism for the soul of America. But "Protestantism is weak. Secularism and Catholicism are strong . . . Protestantism is . . . prodigally wasting its preponderant numbers, its vast wealth and its unique prestige in a system that is no system, in which freedom has gone to seed because the disciplined freedom under Christ has never come to consciousness as a moral imperative" (p. 216).

To support this indictment Dr. Morrison points to the 43,000,000 Protestants who, with scarcely twice as many members as the Roman Church, have 17½ times as many local churches; to the estimated $700,000,000 expended annually for Protestant church causes of which eighty per cent was spent on these local churches. Two thirds of this could be dispensed with if sectarian pride and competition were overcome. Furthermore, every one of the 230 denominations maintains its own separate central headquarters, an enormous waste of overhead.

Meanwhile the freedom which is the glory of Protestantism is threatened on one side by biblical literalism and creedalism and on the other by sectarian fragmentation. The true "freedom in Christ" is acknowledgment of the lordship of Christ and subordination of our man-made authorities to his spirit. But the authority of the Spirit is a vagary unless it is given some clearer definition, and the author offers his formula: "the ecumenical intelligence of the church under the guidance of the Spirit, and . . . the free flow of thought . . . in the spiritual and intellectual democracy of the Christian community" (p. 196). Here is a type of authoritative guidance which allows for growth and yet maintains the accumulated wealth of Christian experience.

What proposals does Dr. Morrison offer for achieving an ecumenical Protestantism? In two valuable chapters he proposes three procedures and evaluates their progress to date: 1. coöperation on a federal basis, 2. interdenominational mergers to reduce the number of sects, and 3. a truly ecumenical church now. But this last requires "a spiritual revolution in the mind and conscience of the whole Protestant community," and this pentecostal outbreak will be one which acknowledges the sole supreme authority of Christ. And this in turn brings us back to the formula quoted in the preceding paragraph.

It must be admitted that this "spirit of Christ" remains elusive even at the end of the discussion; and perhaps the latter part of the formula is the better part. In the volume, however, a distinction is drawn between the "constitution" and the

"fellowship" of the church; but this distinction is withdrawn again when on p. 196 Dr. Morrison tells us that "Jesus . . . in effect said that the whole community of believers—this is, the Christian church—was to be the bearer and only 'custodian' of the truth, and it was to receive the truth under the perpetual guidance of the Spirit."

The book as a whole is so good that it may seem captious to question some minor points of fact. We are told that Catholics do not support the public schools (p. 66). But do not Catholics pay taxes for support of our schools? Surely it is inaccurate to say that contemporary teaching of English literature refuses "to reveal the depths and heights of human feeling and insight" in Shakespeare; and focuses exclusively on "the mechanics of the poetry" (p. 58). One is surprised to learn, after the energetic leadership of the liberal social gospel movement that "liberalism did not propose a radical criticism of this culture in the light of Christian faith" (p. 88). The time will come when liberalism, caught for the moment in the backlash of disillusionment, will come again into its own. Baptists will be skeptical of the generalization that "in the ordination of a minister, the test . . . has less and less to do with his doctrinal 'soundness'" (p. 188). Would that it were true!

Here, then, is a book to ponder; and unless our denominational leaders take positive steps to meet its challenge, the leadership of the church in this country is doomed. For this is a crucial time, not only for Protestantism but for religion itself.

EDWIN E. AUBREY

Philo, by Harry Austryn Wolfson, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1947, 2 vols., pp. xvi, 462, and xiv, 531, $10.

Archæology has done rather well for the Jewish historiography of biblical times and lands. Ever since the rulers of the great powers stopped World War I in order to realign for World War II, many discoveries in the lands of the Fertile Crescent have made it possible to prove amply enough the essential reliability of the Bible. Yet it does not seem to have been generally noted, largely perhaps for lack of the colorful and sensational assistance of archæology, that a revolutionary change has been taking place also for the period of the Second Jewish Commonwealth.

The change, it seems, has taken on two major aspects: 1. The period of the Second Jewish Commonwealth, instead of being regarded as essentially but an intertestamental period, something of an inconsequential interlude between the epochs covered by the Hebrew Bible and the New Testament, has come to be regarded as an important epoch in its own right. Two illustrations of this aspect may be given here. (a) In *The Haverford Symposium on Archæology and the Bible* no provision was made for a chapter on this period; but contrast now the symposium on *The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow,* where no less than four chapters deal specifically with the period in question. (b) What has come to be called the apocryphal literature was regarded by the Jews as unworthy of being made part of their Bible, and by large segments of the Protestant church as inferior and even "frivolous"; were it not for the Catholic Church, most of the apocryphal works now extant would not have been preserved. But today, more than ever before, Protestant scholars are devoting more of their labors to these books, and Jewish scholars, under the auspices of the Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, are now busy on a thirty-volume edition of *Jewish Apocryphal Literature,* to "reclaim these apocryphal writings as part of the creative genius of the Jewish people." 2. It is at long last becoming increasingly recognized that the Septuagint, the apocryphal literature, and the works

of Philo and Josephus are genuinely Jewish works, and that in order to appraise and utilize them properly one must first attempt to understand not only their Græco-Roman environment and the rising (Judæo-) Christian movement, but—and especially so—their Jewish background and sources. When one recalls that the noted scholar Emil Schürer (who was himself quite devoid of any direct knowledge, and use, of the all-important rabbinic literature) could brand a large proportion of these works as "Jewish Propaganda under a Heathen Mask," and when one realizes that in no one section of Otto Stählin's reference monograph on "Die hellenistisch-jüdische Litteratur" is there any indication that the vast range of the fundamentally important literature produced by the Jews in Hebrew and Aramaic in the postbiblical period was worked, it becomes clear that the importance of the second aspect cannot be emphasized too strongly.

At the very outset it should be stated that Professor Wolfson's *Philo* constitutes a very strong link in the chain of data and evidence for the Jewishness of Philo and of the intertestamental literature in Palestine and the Diaspora round about. By this statement the reviewer means two things: 1. So much of Philo which had been regarded as non-Jewish in origin has been demonstrated by Wolfson to have been derived from Jewish sources; 2. Philo did not adapt the Judaism of his time to Hellenism, but rather did he utilize Hellenism in describing and formulating his concept of Judaism, and was vitally concerned in strengthening it in the process. As put by Wolfson in his brief introductory chapter on "Hellenistic Judaism and Philo": "With all their endeavor to present Judaism to the world in an understandable and acceptable form, the Alexandrian Jewish writers never compromised with popular Greek religion or mythology or the mysteries . . . [they tried] to present Judaism as a philosophy, but philosophy had to yield to Judaism on every point on which the two met in real conflict. This was the common attitude of all the Hellenistic Jewish philosophers before Philo, and this . . . is what we have found to be the attitude of Philo in all his philosophic writings."

Here is the way Professor Wolfson went about proving these two very important things. It is well known that none of Philo's works constitutes a coherent presentation of his over-all *Weltanschauung;* nay more, it has yet to be demonstrated that a system of philosophy, the sort of *magnum opus* which Philo might have written himself, can be reconstructed from all his extant works put together (see E. R. Goodenough, "The Problems of Method in Studying Philo Judæus," *J. B. L.*, LVIII [1939], pp. 51-58). Our author set himself the task of demonstrating and accomplishing this proposition. He has gathered together all that Philo wrote, distributed this material among twelve major topics, subdivided nearly all these major topics into several minor ones, and provided each with the pertinent Jewish, Græco-Roman, and (Judæo-) Christian data, *i.e.*, the data which preceded Philo, to illustrate and account for this philosopher's ideas, and the data which came after Philo, especially the Christian and Moslem, to prove their ultimate dependence upon him. The major topics are: (in Vol. I) Handmaid of Scripture; Scriptural Presuppositions; God, the World of Ideas, and the Logos; Creation and Structure of the World; The Immanent Logos, Laws of Nature, Miracles; Souls, Angels, Immortality; Free Will; (in Vol. II) Knowledge and Prophecy; Proofs of the Existence of God; The Unknowability of God, and Divine Predicates; Ethical Theory; Political Theory. These are preceded by a valuable introductory chapter on "Hellenistic Judaism and Philo," and followed by a chapter on "What Is New in Philo?" The work comes to a close with a Bibliographical Note (with summary reference to the very useful "General Bibliography of Philo Judæus" compiled by H. L. Goodhart and E. R. Goodenough *apud* the lat-

ter's work on *The Politics of Philo Judæus: Practice and Theory*), Abbreviations of Works cited, a superb Index of References (grouped under five headings: Philo, Greek and Latin Authors, Jewish Works and Authors, Christian Works and Authors, and Moslem Works and Authors), an Index of Terms (Greek [including the Septuagint], Latin, Hebrew, and Arabic), and an Index of Subjects and Names.

It seems to the reviewer that the author has amply demonstrated these two significant things. It is true that to those Jews who concerned themselves with Judaism, without regard to the culture of the heathens, Philo's literary activity appeared far less Jewish than non-Jewish (perhaps even anti-Jewish); they saw in it the beginning of serious deviation from the orthodox Judaism of their times. The same view was taken by the (Judæo-) Christians too; they, however, found Philo's "potential" deviation to their liking. They found that it could be used in their quest to blend the essentials of normative Judaism with forms of Græco-Roman theological-political-social thought, to produce what has come to be known as Christianity. That is why the works of Philo were preserved by the church, whereas the name of no important philosopher (*e.g.,* Socrates, Plato, Aristotle), Philo included, is mentioned in the Talmud; and when Epicurus is mentioned by the rabbis, it is not as a proper name but as a noun (*'appikōrōs*) meaning "heretic; one irreverent of religion or authority." What happened to Philo has numerous enough parallels in history, and calls to mind immediately the career of Moses Mendelssohn of Berlin (1729–1786). It was Mendelssohn's avowed and real purpose to retain the orthodox Judaism of his time; yet he could do this, he felt, only by explaining and justifying it in the light of the philosophy of his epoch, by using the philosophical reasoning and terminology of his contemporaries to demonstrate his Judaism. History proved him wrong; that is to say, while Moses himself observed the orthodox regulations concerning prayer, phylacteries, food, the Sabbath, and the like, he unwittingly did help to introduce enough of a wedge into the Orthodox Judaism of his time to make it easier for Reform Judaism to come into being, and for many Jews after him, including his grandson, Felix Mendelssohn the composer, to go over to Christianity. Consequently, Orthodox Judaism does not bother with Moses Mendelssohn, any more than it did with Philo; and yet no one can deny that Philo and Mendelssohn were sincere and loyal Jews, whose careers were devoted to the strengthening of Judaism.

The method in Wolfson's detailed treatment of Philo appealed strongly to the reviewer, especially the use of the Jewish sources. It is well known that the Jewish literary data of post-Philonic times are much more abundant than those of pre-Philonic and Philonic times. Yet one should not for one moment tend to dismiss this abundant post-Philonic material merely because it received written form after the first century of the present era. Three reasons for this *caveat* may be mentioned here. 1. The fact that pre-Philonic material has not been so abundantly preserved in written form is due undoubtedly to the Jewish prohibition and disinclination to put things down in writing until later on, after the destruction of the Jewish state. 2. There must have been a considerable proportion of pre-Philonic material which perished in the course of the numerous and bitter struggles waged by the Jews in the attempt to maintain and to recover their independence from the Roman rulers. 3. The proof of the pudding, ultimately, is in the eating. Whenever Jewish pre-Philonic material is available, Wolfson's treatment has shown conclusively (as does *The Legends of the Jews* as compiled by Louis Ginzberg), as it appears to the reviewer, that no such serious breaks occurred between the epochs preceding and following Philo's *floruit* (first half of the first century A.D.) as to invalidate the proper use of the Jewish post-Philonic data, where the pre-Philonic data are scanty or lack-

ing altogether, as a source for Philo's ideas and reasoning. The student of the Old Testament has now learned to respect and to value biblical data even though they received written form relatively late; thus the oral traditions from about 1800 B.C. to about 1200 B.C., while not written down for the most part until about 900 B.C. and later, are now being proved by archæology to have remarkable value as reliable sources for the historian (*cf.* W. F. Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity,* pp. 33 ff.). (The question as to whether the post-Philonic material has always been used properly is a separate one, and is pertinent equally to the pre-Philonic data and to Philo's own writings.)

The specialist in matters Philonic will ever be thankful to Professor Wolfson for having made available this great scholarly analysis of the significant writings and times of an important man. But the nonspecialist too, if he is wide-awake and interested in Judaism, Hellenism, and Christianity, will profit considerably; he will then realize how utterly inadequate and incompetent is the treatment of Philo at the hands of the noted social philosopher Bertrand Russell, who could devote but seven lines to him in his *History of Western Philosophy* (New York, 1945).

HARRY M. ORLINSKY

Gandhi's Autobiography, by M. K. Gandhi, Washington, Public Affairs Press, ©1948, pp. xi, 640, $5.

Mahatma Gandhi: an Interpretation, by E. Stanley Jones, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, ©1948, pp. 160, $2.

The secular historian, leaving on one side the religious faith in Jesus as a divine incarnation, might place Gandhi along with Socrates and Jesus. All three manifested moral strength with personal simplicity, grasped and taught fundamental principles, and all came to undeserved tragic deaths. Socrates and Jesus have continued of influence in history. It is probable that Gandhi will also. At so short a time after his death one may not be able to say what that influence will be, but one may consider what it has been and should be. Unlike Socrates and Jesus, Gandhi left numerous writings upon which answers to these questions may be based. Of these none is more important than his *Story of My Experiments with Truth* now published in translation with the title *Gandhi's Autobiography.* Though the *Confessions* of Augustine are far more impressive, the *Autobiography* may well take its place beside it in world literature. But the book ends long before his death, even, one may say, just at the beginning of the time when so many eyes throughout the world were turned to him. There is no data at the end of Gandhi's own Introduction. In his last chapter he says that "since 1921" his life "has been so public that there is hardly anything about it that people do not know." Though it is to be regretted that we have not his own accounts and comments on the events of these later years, his *Autobiography* goes far enough to give us a good impression of the kind of man he was and at least of some of his fundamental ideas. But I suggest to the publisher that in future reprints the date of the first Gujerati edition should be given.

By "truth," in his own title to his book, Gandhi meant spiritual integrity. His "experiments" consisted in his persistence in it in face of every temptation to compromise and of any and every suffering. To an extent unsurpassed in human history, he was a man of "selfless" devotion. Of inner humility, he nevertheless maintained an unflinching courage. He knew he was far from perfect and acknowledged with profound regret a lustfulness in his early years and a not infrequent obstinacy. Of his lustfulness only Gandhi himself could fully know, being partly of inner desires and

thoughts. Married in his early teens, by the time he was thirty-seven he had vowed himself to sexual abstinency. His encouragement to others to marry was before he took that vow. Celibacy may have been appropriate for the later activities of Gandhi's life. But I get the impression that with regard to sex he was unbalanced and that that is why he wrote so much of it in the first part of his book. His attitude resembled that of some mediæval Christian monks. It was not in accordance with some fundamental aspects of Hinduism.

Though Gandhi said that his central aim was "self-realization," that was one term the meaning of which he never made clear. He was, however, quite definite in his interpretation of the central principle of *ahimsa* as "universal kindness." Along with, and allied with this was *satyagraha,* the leading concept of his activities in South Africa and in India till his death. Though literally "firmness in truth," he took it to express nonviolent persistence in one's sincere practical conduct in face of all opposition and suffering. He did not originate the idea, but gave a new name, for Hindus primarily, to a principle essentially the same as Tolstoy maintained to be present in the teaching of Jesus. While Gandhi forgave those who committed wrongs, both in his earlier practice of law and in his later political leadership he insisted unrestrainedly on what he conceived to be right. The movement for self-government in India had originated and been carried on long before Gandhi shared in it. In the *Autobiography* we read of the beginnings of his leading a whole people to adopt the method of nonviolent noncoöperation. It was through his influence more than through anything else that the political revolution in India was not by force of arms. In this example, of such magnitude, he proved to mankind that *satyagraha* is a practical substitute for war. In that lies Gandhi's greatness and his importance for humanity. He has challenged us to adopt this faith and method in contrast with reliance on war. Such should be his future world influence. Yet, to judge by his *Autobiography,* it would seem to be a mistake to describe him as a pacifist in the usual meaning of that term. He sided with the British in the first world war, organizing an ambulance corps, and later assisting in recruiting soldiers in India. I suppose he would have said that actual circumstances may necessitate military defence against an aggressor who had already resorted to war. However, on this, I am not clear.

For India itself, there should be another influence of Gandhi's life: the eventual elimination of the evils covered by the term "untouchability." His own example, from his time in South Africa, was more effective than anything he said in this connection. He associated with the so-called "lowest of the low" as with any others, and frequently participated in their usual work of scavengers.

That Gandhi regarded himself as conforming with the fundamentals of Hinduism is evident, but he made no claims to be a scholar of Hindu thought, from the standpoint of which some criticisms could be urged against him. He ranked with the moral reformers rather than with the philosophers of India. Of great interest and significance is his statement: "Three moderns have left a deep impress on my life and captivated me: Raychandbhai by his living contact; Tolstoy by his book *The Kingdom of God Is within You;* and Ruskin by his *Unto This Last*" (p. 114). He wrote that this work of Ruskin "brought about an instantaneous and practical transformation of my life" (p. 365). Later, he translated it into Gujerati. In England, South Africa, and India, Gandhi had close contacts with Christians. Though he considered himself to be ethically in conformity with the true Christian spirit, he wrote, "It was far more than I could believe that Jesus was the only incarnate Son of God and that only he who believed in him would have everlasting life" (p. 170).

Dr. Stanley Jones was asked by the publishers to write the book listed above.

They could not have made a better choice. Dr. Jones had close association with Gandhi for very many years and has performed his difficult task with sympathy, yet also with judicious criticism. His book is valuable for its description of Gandhi and his teachings, but even more so for its attention to the important events later than those covered in the *Autobiography*. It may be said to be an indispensable supplement to Gandhi's own story. The price of the book is so small, making it so easily accessible to readers of CROZER QUARTERLY, that detailed treatment here is not necessary. No criticisms I should make bear on what is important in it. One suggestion only, I would like to make: Dr. Jones glides over the reasons why Gandhi could not accept Christianity in the manner it seems he himself does.

ALBAN G. WIDGERY

Separate Church and State Now, by Joseph Martin Dawson, New York, Smith, 1948, pp. viii, 220, $2.50.

The editor said, "If he pussyfoots, lambaste him!" The reviewer reports that there is no need for lambasting because there is no pussyfooting. On the contrary, the author never pulls his punches, though he fights fairly and in the open. The major theme is objection to efforts of the Catholic hierarchy to break down the constitutional provision for the separation of church and state in America. That theme is well supported and eloquently presented.

Cases are considered on their merits—the presence of an ambassador at the Vatican; Catholic invasions of the public schools in Cincinnati, Dixon, New Mexico, and elsewhere; recent decisions of the Supreme Court relating to separation; released time as the Catholics use it; etc. None of them is flattering to the hierarchy. Strictures against Catholicism do not mar the book, however, because the author copiously quotes Catholic sources which are as frank as *Mein Kampf*.

A conclusion to be derived from this book is that the aims and methods of the hierarchy come no closer to comprehending the freedom-loving spirit of Protestant America than do the objectives and techniques of communism. Indeed, intentions of the international organizations of Catholicism and communism are startlingly similar, and methods employed are nearly identical. Broadly considered, they are: 1. The authoritarian premise: We possess the truth, final and complete; 2. Power must be secured; 3. No holds are barred. Hierarchical Catholicism and hierarchical communism are sworn enemies simply because they are rivals for power over the body and soul of man, not because they desire to serve the spirit of man. Both are completely alien to the tradition of America as set forth in the Constitution.

Any number of quotations from Catholic sources could be taken from *Separate Church and State Now* to document the above statements. Here are a few.

Regarding authority. "In case of direct contradiction, making it impossible for both jurisdictions to be exercised, the jurisdiction of the (Roman) Church prevails, and that of the State is excluded" (*Catholic Encyclopedia,* Vol. XIV, p. 251, c.d.). "If the laws of the State are manifestly at variance with the divine law, containing enactments hurtful to the (Roman) Church, or conveying injunctions adverse to the duties imposed by (Roman Catholic) religion, or if they violate in the person of the supreme Pontiff the authority of Jesus Christ, then truly, to resist becomes a positive duty, to obey, a crime; a crime, moreover, combined with misdemeanor against the State itself, inasmuch as every offence levelled against (Roman Catholic) religion is also a sin against the State" (Encyclical Letter *Sapientiæ Christianæ*).

Concerning the getting of power. "But constitutions can be changed, and non-

(Roman) Catholic sects may decline to such a point that the political proscription of them may become feasible and expedient. What protection would they then have against a (Roman) Catholic State? The latter could logically tolerate only such religious activities as were confined to the members of the dissenting group. It could not permit them to carry on general propaganda nor accord their organization certain privileges that had formerly been extended to all religious corporations" (John A. Ryan, writing under *imprimatur* of Cardinal Hayes). "When we are in a minority we ask for religious liberty in the name of your (Protestant) principle. When we are in the majority we refuse it in the name of ours" (Louis Veuillot, a French Catholic writer).

Catholic use of invective. "The public school system is a swindle on the people—a foul disgrace in matters of moral and should be abolished" (New York *Tablet*). "The common schools of this country are sinks of moral pollution and nurseries of hell" (Chicago *Tablet*). "The public schools have produced nothing but a godless generation of thieves and blackguards" (Father Schaner).

A cathechistical definition of liberalism will be of interest to readers of the Crozer Quarterly. It is "the doctrine that the state has neither the right nor the duty to be united to the church and to protect it." This considerably enlarges the understanding of liberalism held by most Protestants. "Why is liberalism to be condemned? A. 1. Because it denies all subordination of the state to the church; 2. Because it confounds liberty with right; 3. Because it despises the social dominion of Christ and rejects the benefits derived therefrom" (*Manual of Christian Doctrine, imprimatur* of Cardinal Dougherty, pp. 132-133).

HARMON M. GEHR

Modern Man's Conflicts: The Creative Challenge of a Global Society, by Dane Rudhyar, New York, Philosophical Library, 1948, pp. viii, 228, $3.75.

A significant claim is made in this book for modern man's attention and loyalties. But it lies buried beneath a conglomeration of bold-faced terms (whether they are intentionally this or not is sometimes hard to say), innumerable instances of terms and sentences in italics or quotation marks (*e.g.,* "atomic bomb"), and vague metaphors which range from fire to fecundation. The claim is this: The new industrial revolution of potential abundance calls for a corresponding revolution in culture, in order that the new power will be used for a plentitude of material and spiritual goods, not for destruction. This is not *merely* a human aim, but is the expression of an "ineradicable and inexorable drive impelling humanity toward a single universal goal. This goal is the fulfillment of man's common humanity in 'personality,' *the complete and total actualization of the seed-potential of humanity*" (p. 30). This calls for an inner rebirth of individuals consecrated as "potential channels of expression for the answer of the spirit to this human need" (p. 26). For, in the words quoted from St. Exupery, "The individual is a mere path, what matters is Man, who takes that path" (p. 57). Thus by pursuit of a "transpersonal way," personality can be achieved. The catalytic agent for the process is psychology (apparently along the lines proposed by Jung) which now promises a new working harmony of science and religion (*pace* Professor Hocking; *cf.* his *Science and the Idea of God,* chap. II).

The metaphysical stage for this drama consists of three essences contained in and integrated by God or Space (and other places in the book, it seems, by Man); namely, spirit, form, and substance (p. 202). The latter is the material of reality which is formed and reformed by spirit which, in turn, is the answer to every need. The setting for the modern act is management—on a world scale.

Some statements made about management might be taken to mean what would be a fatal separation between two "polarities" of policy formation and execution. But somehow or other the author intends their integration. Presumably this integration is attained through the function of deity. In any case no concrete techniques for achieving their integration are indicated or specifically called for by the author. If God should fail in this function, it is difficult to see what would distinguish the new world management from typical dictatorial procedures. But the author doubtless believes that the new individuals, reborn through the midwifery of psychology, will necessarily be able to envisage and institute the needed techniques.

Early in the book a kind of acknowledgment appears (p. 14) to the Rosicrucian idea of God as Universal Fire. A vague metaphorical application of this idea is persistently made throughout about the first third of the book. This application might be less vague than it is to me, in the minds of careful students of Jung. But it strikes me as significant that Rudhyar seems to find in Jung a ground for genuine aspiration whereas Philip Wylie can find in the same psychology the ground for his claim that his "thesis, offered in the spirit of science . . . begins and ends with the assurance that you, good reader, are a beast, and so am I, and that we are nothing else" (*An Essay on Morals*, p. 19). The Continental approach in psychology (Freud, Adler, Young) and Rudhyar's use of it (in contrast, for example, with the psychological approaches of James and Dewey) strike me as precisely analogous, in social inquiry, to the status of scientific ideas in the early renaissance before Galileo and Descartes succeeded in eliminating from the conceptual material of natural inquiry the mystical and teleological aspects of experience. I fail to find in either Rudhyar or Wylie any concern to formulate conceptual material operationally for experimental testing. Rudhyar, at least, is just as interested in achieving concrete transformations for the good life as was Paracelsus the Great, and as far as I can see is just as confused in his muddled intellectual efforts. Guarding against any underestimation of the clinical achievements of Continental psychology, we can, nevertheless, in America recognize the pressing need for an adequate scientific formulation of concepts for further exploitation of these discoveries, a need which is inhibited by the mystical and teleological formulations made by Freud, Adler, and Jung. It is the difference between the later Kepler searching for the mechanical order of the planets and the earlier Kepler listening for the music of the spheres.

For American philosophy, at least in its characteristic strain, has achieved a healthy sophistication which can liberate us from a blind worship of science as a key, not to say the only key, to the mystery of existence. Once rid of this spectator fallacy, as Dewey has called it, we can turn to a universal use of the method of science in solving ethical and social problems without fear of *reducing* human purpose and the ineffable qualities of concrete realities to the *nothing but* status of atoms and the void. But this liberation from the superstitions of science is hardly justification for opening the doors to "'new" European superstitions in whatever form.

Yet some critical and imaginative readers of Rudhyar, whose faith in the human use of science has been increased and enriched by liberation from scientific and religious orthodox restraints, might find vague suggestions for a concept of "God" as naturalistic as Dewey's, but which could serve more adequately than his to clarify the religious confusion of our times which, if unclarified, will solidify in the West at least in a new paganism now parading in various neo-istic garbs as "Christianty." The only hopeful alternative I can see, and that a *religious* one and one which I incline toward, is M. C. Otto's affirmative humanist faith in the nonexistence of God and in man's coöperative use of science through creative bargaining

HORACE S. FRIES

Thinking Christianly, by W. Burnet Easton, Jr., New York, Macmillan, 1948, pp. xii, 136, $2.50.

This title contains a somewhat unusual term. The word *Christian* does not often appear in an adverbial form. How should Christians think? This is the question which the author keeps in mind and to which he gives, in very persuasive terms, one of the important answers to the question. It is not an argument in support of the Christian faith. The basic beliefs of Christianity: the beliefs in God, Jesus Christ, incarnation, immortality, prayer, and other tenets of the Christian religion, are assumed. There is no attempt in this book to establish or defend these beliefs. Rather, the author follows a different line of thinking. In the light of the belief in the Christian God, for instance, what attitudes and convictions should possess the minds of Christian people? Dr. Easton insists quite rightly that Christianity has something very important to say to the world, probably the only really important thing to say to our world. This important thing, he is sure, we are not saying to the world at all well because we Christians do not think Christianly.

But what is "thinking Christianly"? This, of course, is the burden of the entire book and cannot be answered in any satisfactory way in this review. The reviewer desires to express his very sincere thanks to Dr. Easton for having written this book which he says is "an attempt of one Christian to begin to try to think Christianly about various aspects of our modern life, faith, and practice." He is speaking for many of his fellows who have come to the place in their own thinking where general terms must be clothed with specific and helpful content, adequate to sustain them in the midst of chaos, actual or threatened. There is no question but that Christian people need such help today. This is a book which will be welcomed by many perplexed believers.

Most of us are, indeed, too much concerned about our physical security, creature comforts and interesting gadgets. We need to have a greater and more dynamic faith in God, the Eternal. But why should the process of thinking from the Eternal to the Incarnation in Jesus of Nazareth be any more "thinking Christianly" than the reverse of that process? Indeed, for many of us the process is from Jesus, the Friend and Master of men, to God, the Father of Jesus Christ and our Father. This has been the experience of countless men from the days of Philip to our own. And why isn't it also "thinking Christianly" to come finally to see that we who devote ourselves to God because we love the Christ and see God revealed in him are, as Jesus said, children of God? If this is true, we share in the Incarnation. God is indeed embodied in each one of us and we become fellow workers with him in bringing the kingdom of God to glorious fruition. The incarnation of God is, indeed, an astounding fact in Christianity and a most glorious element of our faith. But why are we limited to supposing that God was incarnated "once and for all" in Jesus of Nazareth? Isn't it reasonable and Christian to think that Paul's idea that "God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself" is the cue to our understanding of the redemption of the Roman world because they, too, became "ministers of reconciliation?

I have used the illustration of thinking about the incarnation as an indication of what seems to me to be a limitation upon the wide usefulness of Dr. Easton's book. He is assuming a particular theology as the essence of Christianity. If one grants the validity of the theological position of the author, his way of "thinking Christianly" rather logically follows. Liberalism comes in for some discrediting. Insofar as liberalism moves in the direction of humanism, this criticism of liberalism is justly deserved. There is a liberalism, however, which does not surrender its faith in God, in Jesus Christ the Redeemer, in the Holy Spirit, in the worth of the human

soul, or in the church as the Body of Christ on earth. This liberalism can in all humility trust God, but it cannot set aside its own responsibility for pioneering thought and prophetic action.

CHARLES M. BOND

The Religion of Maturity, by John Wick Bowman, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, ©1948, pp. 336, $3.

This book is an attempt to show that "Christianity is the religion of maturity." Three elements of maturity are named as distinguishing characteristics: poise, originality, disinterestedness. Jesus is the founder and the "authority" of this religion, and the "redemptive community," or the "church," is the means or agent for the propagation and embodiment of that religion.

To support this thesis the author passes in massive review five "religions," all of which are parts of the current of Hebrew-Jewish religious and ethical development. They are: the religion of the word, as it appears in Hebrew prophetism; the religion of the altar, the priestly attempt to mediate the prophetic revelation by ritualistic methods; the religion of the book, the scribal mediation of the prophetic word by means of prescriptive teachings; the religion of the throne, the apocalyptic interpretation, or misinterpretation, of the divine unfolding to the prophets; the religion of maturity. While the second, third, and fourth have relationships to the first, they are mainly distortions of the prophetic understanding of the divine. The fifth not only properly represents the prophetic religion but it shows "through the medium of a living demonstration, that the divine word can be realized in the contemporary historical situation, though only and always by a divine act" (pp. 274-275).

Each of these "religions" is analyzed as to its authority, function, method, and effects. Their dominating concepts, both theological and ethical, are discussed. The attitude of Jesus toward these "religions" as they were manifest in his day receives consideration. While he was familiar with all of them and did not hesitate to draw ideas and ethical values from them, his evaluation and use of them were always on the basis of their faithfulness to the prophetic revelation of the word of God. The author's estimate of these religions is that the fifth is the glorious consummation of the first, while the "religion of the throne" was the poorest and least valuable of the entire group.

It is a pretentious task which the author has set himself, and in its prosecution he reveals familiarity with many phases of the material under consideration. The external history is well mastered by the writer, and many parts of the discussion of such matters are of genuine worth. It is also true that there are religious insights of value in some of the volume's pages. But the interpretation of external facts is quite another matter and one of which not a few criticisms should be made.

The method in general is that of the "proof text" on a grand scale. But instead of resorting to the use of brief scriptural quotations, the procedure is to select certain phases of these "religions" in the realms of ideas and practices and to use them for the support of a subtly preconceived idea. The chief criticism which issues against this is that almost invariably these ideas and practices are removed from the social matrix apart from which they cannot be properly understood. This selective method is manifest throughout the book. The high moral teachings of the prophets and their position as "men of God" may be admitted, but some of their teachings were not so lofty. In any case they would lose no essential value by being integrated with the shame and tragedy amid which many of them were born and apart from which they lose their sharpest significance.

The schematic form of the discussion is artificial and too rigid. At times it imparts to the volume an atmosphere of historical unreality. The "religions" which come in for adverse criticism were not imposed by individuals or groups operating in a spiritual vacuum. They were vitally related to historical situations that were sometimes splendid, but more often tragic and sordid. They deserve a more understanding treatment than that which is meted out to them. They met important religious needs, perhaps not completely, but vitally nevertheless. The discussion of each religion is almost entirely in terms of its doctrinal expression, or in terms of the author's interpretation of that expression. But these phases of Hebrew-Jewish religion were not merely conceptual, they were vital and social. This fact receives too little recognition by the author.

The interpretation of Jesus is disappointing. While there are excellent utterances in those chapters, the too easy attitude in dealing with difficult and critical questions about him invalidates not a few statements. The literary study of gospel origins does not deserve the actual, if not theoretical, ignoring that it receives. The important and difficult question of the relation of Jesus to Jewish eschatological thinking merits a franker and more balanced discussion than is given to it. The treatment of Jesus is on the basis of selections that support the view presented, while those that might challenge that view are passed by. References to early Christian thought, especially Pauline, manifest the same unfortunate characteristic. The discussion comes close to being *ex parte.*

In the present situation in which theological scholarship throughout the world finds itself there is a rare opportunity for leadership afforded to British and American scholars. But that opportunity will not be met by a continuation of the all too prevalent attitude of interpreting history in terms of theological and ecclesiastical tradition rather than interpreting the tremendous significance of the Christian religion in frankly historical terms. The reviewer wishes that a volume of the size and purposes of this one might lead forward but unfortunately he cannot say that it does.

ERNEST W. PARSONS

Prayers for Young People, by Abigail Acker Johnson, Philadelphia, Westminster, ©1947, pp. 130, $1.50.

This book was sent to me about a year ago. At least a dozen times I have attempted to review it, always without success. Though the editor who greatly esteems timeliness in his reviews may feel nothing softer than righteous indignation, I am grateful for this delay. For, in studying these prayers I have had to beat my way back over more than forty years that I might think again in the thought forms of my youth. Yet I am not sure that even this return fits me fully to enter into the mood of Mrs. Johnson and the young people for whom she writes. They look out on wider and brighter horizons than I could see when first my mind reasoned and my heart yearned to pray. The world, as it was then exhibited to me under the cold light of science, was "red in tooth and claw." I often feared that God was something less than a friend. Appeasement of his displeasure was a principal objective of my prayers. The youth of this generation have been taught under an improved system of religious education that they live in a friendly universe marred only by the sinfulness of men. If they are less sure than I was that humanity, with the guidance of scientific truth and a broadening social conscience, treads an upward tending spiral, they are more happily aware of God as a near Companion.

This changed outlook is evident in the prayers which Mrs. Johnson provides. Consequently her book is pervaded by a serene spirit, a joy in life, a glad acceptance

of the world. But this serenity is not like that of the Greeks who clung the more resolutely to every lovely element of earth because they saw human existence against the background of tragedy. There is no *De profundis* in this book, no sigh of patient sorrow, no reasoning with the divine justice. This is, perhaps, as it should be in a manual of devotion intended for the use of the young.

Yet these omissions, more than the text itself, raise certain questions about the nature of the prayer life. One asks whether maturity should envy the calm assurance of youth at prayer. For which the answer seems to be: Not if the mature man has won his way through the darkness that hangs above "the great world's altar stairs" and has come out again into the light of God. For by long practice we ought to learn that the supreme values of prayer are found in the victories of faith over circumstance. A more relevant question, therefore, is this: Has our adult Christianity won these victories on a large enough scale to make its prayer experience a source of courage for the young when they shall have come down from their bright plateau and moved out on the rough plain where their elders have struggled? Thus, in the hands of a minister well settled in life, the book may, by indirection, perform a ministry for which it was not intended. It may even do more for him than for his young people.

To be instructive or hortatory in prayer is a temptation which often causes the mature Christian to stumble. Many pastors and other promoters of good causes do not know the difference between a prayer addressed to God and an argument urged on an audience. Little more than a week ago an internationally known Christian leader, a man celebrated as "powerful in prayer," addressed a group of young people. Immediately after the chairman introduced him he surprised everyone by beginning to pray. One cannot know what effect his praying had on young minds; it was plain to an adult that the man was talking over God's shoulder to the congregation. His prayer was a cold war of words intended to soften his hearers for the mighty assault which was shortly to follow in the address. One felt that if God got into anyone's heart during that meeting it was on the prompting of his own compassion, for his presence was not invited. And if he swept his elder servant aside to make room for himself, who could regret aught but the necessity? Mrs. Johnson, though she offers social and national prayers for group use, does not make classroom lectures of them. They are addressed to God alone and seem to carry only what purposes and longings she has found already at work in the hearts of her young friends.

These prayers are notable for another omission. They make only sparing use of the vocatives which, if they be too freely employed, become an offense. Is it necessary to re-call God's attention by frequent evocations of the divine Name? Is the Lord less capable of sustained attention than we are? Surely Christians may share the faith of Elijah who, when he contended with the priests on the mountain, knew that his God was not wandering through the groves with footloose Baal. Yet last summer I heard a minister who, it seemed to me, repeated the Name at least fifty times in the course of his pastoral prayer. His nominatives were richly varied, to be sure, but it was evident that he used each with no better purpose than to keep his prayer running while he considered what to say next or how to say it. Because this halting address is a common pulpit fault, I am moved to speculate on the possibility that God may be less offended by the thoughtless profanity of ungodly men than by the near-blasphemy of his saints who use the Name as a stopgap between their unordered thoughts. Why should a man who sweats over the preparation of a sermon which is to be spoken before his equals sit down and puff and

mop his brow while he speaks in an offhand manner to his God? Mrs. Johnson avoids vain repetitions. Having asked the Lord's attention, she trusts that he will hear her with patience.

Something must be said about the language of these prayers. Mrs. Johnson is capable of lyricism, but she does not always attain it. One must remember that she attempts to put the thoughts and desires of young people into the vernacular of youth. But it seems to me that she sometimes errs on the side of informality. It is a good rule that the language of prayer should be determined by the majesty of the Person spoken to rather than by the limitations of the person speaking. That is one reason why the novice should have access to well-written books of devotion. Matthew Arnold wrote two long essays to prove that an English translation of Homer should be in "the grand style." Should less be claimed for the medium of communication between the human soul and God? Man should be confident when he approaches heaven's Majesty, but never free and easy. There are many formalities and graces not natural to youth that ought to be learned. Such contractions as *can't* and *don't* are out of place in prayer. These and a few other lapses mar Mrs. Johnson's pages. But not often. The language, exact, graceful, and dignified in most places, sets a standard for youth. The few slips are mentioned because they get a far wider circulation through the pulpit than they will get through this admirable little book.

I gratefully acknowledge that *Prayers for Young People* has helped me.

ROBERT MUNSON GREY

Prayer in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, by Norman B. Johnson, Philadelphia, Society of Biblical Literature, 1948, pp. iv, 77, $1.

This second volume of the *JBL* Monograph Series is published, as was its predecessor (Torrey's *Lives of the Prophets*), through the generosity of the Lucius N. Littauer Foundation. But by the sale of these *Beiheften* the Society has begun to build its own fund towards the publication of further items. Professor Ralph Marcus, who directed the writing of this dissertation, has been named as editor of the Monograph Series.

The present work should prove deservedly popular as well as soundly instructive to students of the Bible, the history of religion, and, in particular, the Old Testament Apocrypha.

In the first place, prayer is a subject strangely neglected in biblical studies. Apart from a good summary article, like E. R. Bernard's in the fourth volume of Hasting's *Dictionary of the Bible,* the references a student can find are almost nil. Not a single index reference, for example, will be found to "prayer" in either Davidson's or Stevens' *Theologies,* nor even in Matthews' *The Religious Pilgrimage of Israel,* Albright's *From the Stone Age to Christianity,* or Bewer's *Literature of the Old Testament.* The situation is barely saved by Pfeiffer's *Introduction* (pp. 33 f.) for the student of the Old Testament and Burrows' *Outlines* (especially pp. 131 and 244) for the student of the Scriptures generally.

One may turn, then, from the sketch by Bernard, or its equivalent, and from brief remarks like those of Pfeiffer and Burrows, with whetted appetite to this full-length discussion of Scriptural prayers. For while the author's real concern is with the prayers of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, every part of his treatment begins with illustration from the Old Testament. And most sections issue in the New Testament, or in ancient Jewish literature. Professor Johnson has therefore demonstrated incidentally that there is a wealth of material, especially in the Old Testa-

ment, for a direct approach to the religious thought of its writers, which has not been appreciated as it deserves.

The rich development of this material in the extracanonical literature of the ancient Jews is amply illustrated in three descriptive chapters on: 1. the aims of the prayers in the Apocrypha: thirteen sections; 2. the means of inducing God to heed: seven sections; and 3. the divine responses to prayer: four sections. For example: help in warfare is an aim; appeal to God's dignity or pride, an inducement; an angel may be the response. In the fourth, summary chapter, these studies yield insight into the Jewish conceptions of God's omnipotence, omniscience, immanence, omnipresence, anthropopathic traits, and fundamental qualities of justice and mercy. But these theological topics come alive when thus set forth on the basis of a real religious experience like prayer.

The Apocrypha and Pseudipegrapha surely deserve more attention from Protestant students and preachers. This book will go far towards securing that attention. Even though one limits himself to the books available in the *American Translation* of the Apocrypha, there is much that may be followed up from the elaboration of this single subject that will benefit students of either Testament. The reader who wants to make fruitful use of this monograph should prepare his own index of Old Testament, Apocryphal, and New Testament references. If he is a preacher, texts and the materials of their exegesis will pour out upon him. If he is a scholar, he will come perforce to grips with what Heiler has well named "the central phenomenon of religion." In any case, he will be grateful to the author of this excellent little book.

CHARLES M. COOPER

The Doctrine of Our Redemption, by Nathaniel Micklem, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, ©1948, pp. 155, $1.50.

In spite of its title Principal Micklem's book is a devotional essay rather than a systematic theological treatise. He believes that none of the doctrines of redemption is sufficient to grasp the full mystery of Christian experience. Therefore he sets out to examine the traditional attempts to interpret the meaning of the life and death of Christ in order to appreciate the measure of truth in each doctrine and to derive from each of the important traditions that spiritual insight and principle which adds illumination to the whole meaning of the gospel. Briefly but skillfully he discusses the conception of redemption in the Bible, in the early church fathers both Eastern and Western, in the mediæval thinkers and the Reformers. In each case his intention is to communicate to the reader as directly as possible the spiritual experience which underlies theological dogmas. He does this by relying on testimonies from Christian experience and by using, often quite brilliantly, analogies from common human experience.

There are many good things in Micklem's development of this approach to theology. It is true that all theories of the atonement seem to break down when pressed to the limit. Micklem's theological sympathies are broad. He contributes to ecumenical understanding when he shows that the Eastern fathers were something more than "materialists," and when he rightly insists that Anselm's and Abelard's doctrines were far richer than the usual textbook summaries recognize. Many individual paragraphs will be helpful to the general reader to whom the book is primarily addressed. Among these are the discussion of faith, of original sin, and of the significance of the ultimate questions in relation to practical action. The whole book breathes a warm and genuine Christian spirit.

If the book leaves many unsatisfied, as it did this reviewer, the reason I believe is that Micklem has fallen into the trap of so much devotional writing. There is not enough intellectual discrimination and analysis to serve as a ladder for the progress of the spirit toward understanding. The difficulty in this book shows clearly how necessary rigorous intellectual analysis is to the Christian experience itself. We need some solid grasp of the method by which we find the sense of our faith, and we need to see as sharply as we can where the basic problems lie. The final impression left by the present book is that of a series of pictures, quotations (too many), and excellent "thoughts for meditation," but no organized impact of a perspective which we can grasp and whose implications can be stated.

For example, Micklem emphasizes the transformation which takes place in the life of the redeemed. "We are converted or redeemed in so far as we act from the motive of the love of God" (p. 114). This sounds perilously close to salvation by works. In any case Micklem blurs the distinction between Augustine and the pietistic tradition on the one hand, and the doctrine of Luther and Calvin, in which forgiveness is the initiatory basis of regeneration, on the other. The practical question of what it is that initiates the new life needs more discriminating attention.

Two special points deserve comment. Redemption is treated from the point of view of the transformation of the individual. Micklem says "the redemption of society is a consequence of, not a substitute for, the redemption of the individual" (p. 7). This can too easily be interpreted as the half-truth against which the social gospel rightly protested. In this connection many readers are certain to be troubled by Micklem's twice-used illustration of a cruelly abused servant girl who is reconciled to her lot because she identifies her sufferings with those of Christ. Some words about social justice in the Christian view would have been highly appropriate here.

American readers in the free church tradition will be interested in looking for signs of the trend toward a High-Church doctrine which seems to characterize contemporary British Congregationalism. Micklem's references to the sacrament are very brief; but he does emphasize throughout a sacramental theory of the church. When he says, "The Communion or the faithful and powerful preaching of the Cross is not the reminder of Calvary, but the bringing of Calvary down into the present," we want to ask, why "Communion *or* preaching"? Should it not be "Communion *and* the preached word"? Surely a Protestant conception of the sacrament will always hold that the personal word must be present, at least implicitly, along with the bread and the wine.

It is a book for spiritual stimulation, but it leaves one eager to have a fuller treatment of redemption from Principal Micklem.

DANIEL D. WILLIAMS

What Is Happening in Religious Education, by Raymond B. Johnson, Boston, Beacon, 1948, pp. 88, $1.50.

The author of this volume, "teacher for ten years, teacher and headmaster for twenty-four years, and a minister for four years . . . active in religious education for thirty-six years," throws the spotlight upon religious educational trends he has seen emerging during the last four decades.

The main thesis of the book is that religious education is desperately trying to free itself from the shackles of traditional authoritarianism. The chief obstacles retarding this endeavor are the leaders who are unaware that something very revolutionary is taking place; parents who refuse to accept the implications of the new education for themselves as well as for their children; curriculum builders who hesitate

to make use of the latest and best findings the scientific method has made available. While the author grants that many religious educators are paying lip service to recently discovered psychological and pedagogical principles, he accuses them of unforgivable inconsistency. Their failure to reject entirely the traditional emphasis upon the content-centred approach has led to "a strange confusion." He claims that "They insist that at one and the same time we can have the latest with the earliest stages of development! The experience-centered and the theology centered school! A hopeless straddle, reminding us of the warning of Jesus that we cannot 'put new wine into old wine skins'" (p. 12). The author flatly refuses Paul Vieth's motif in curriculum making—the Christian "constant"—"God's redemptive purpose in Christ to men" (p. 14).

It is quite clear that Mr. Johnson would also reject the position of Harner who claims that while there are those who think of God as "outside the educational process" and others of "God as the process," there are also those who think of "God in the process." For Mr. Johnson there is no such middle ground. He pleads for a one-world approach, and asks his readers to stop trying to live in two worlds.

To state it in his own words, "It (the 'one-world-pull') adopts the scientific attitude in the search for evidence rather than for 'conclusions I like.' It seeks for the divine through the human. . . . Its primary aim is growth; it even goes so far as to conceive God as part of the growing process. It is a prophet of change because it is ever trying to improve individuals and the world they live in" (p. 34).

Liberal churches, too, come in for their share of criticism. "They want their children to be in the swim, not to be pointed out as heretics. They want them in a certain social set, the rest of whose members are Evangelical Protestants. Religion shouldn't intrude here!" (p. 22).

The solution suggested is that education must free itself from the "two-world-pull." The authority of the past must be replaced by an endeavor "to guide children in a natural development of religious faith based primarily on their own direct experiences. We do seek the emotional conditioning of children for a 'one-world' or universal outlook in all inquiry. . . . We do not teach a finished gospel. . . . We do not believe that the moral law has been finally and supernaturally revealed" (pp. 53–54). Those who accept this point of view will "resist the temptation to be governed by some outside authority created by men, no matter how wise, of other times" (p. 55).

The religious educators of young children will keep in mind that "not until they are about nine years of age are they ready to go far beyond the horizon of their own immediate experiences—not until then should the Bible come in" (p. 59). We must frankly face the question whether the Bible is taught to children because it helps them to live, or because we have some hazy notion that because "The Bible has little use or meaning for us adults . . . it must, therefore, be children's material" (p. 62); but we are warned that "no children of any age will see any point in studying a Bible that is apparently not used in the adult world they are so eager to join" (p. 78). It is the author's firm conviction, however, that Bible study is essential for students from the junior department up through to the adult department. It will be most profitable if the historical method of interpretation is followed.

Attention is called to a number of excellent texts now available for the various age-groups. We are warned that because of the stubborn resistance on the part of so many leaders and groups to the "one-world" approach, the production of suitable materials is greatly hampered and thus exceedingly slow in forthcoming. The content-centred and cramming type of teaching is severely criticized. Beware of "teachers afraid that they will not finish something before the end of the year. Finish what?

Finish the formation of character? Finish the nurture of attitudes? Finish the preparation for the good life? Why do we cling to the idea that there is an irreducible minimum of fact or formula or body of knowledge that is essential to a given age or time?" (p. 73). The antidote to this "cramming" process is adult education. There is very little hope for the progressive school unless we have lifelong education. "And when the adults in the church school have become fully convinced that this matter of education is a never-ending proposition, when they themselves do not give the impression that religious education ends when you leave the church school or finish certain courses, the young people will find it easier to follow their natural inclination to go on learning" (p. 74).

The last three chapters are a clarion call to the church to take adult education, and especially the training of parents, more seriously. The Bible will remain an unknown or utterly misunderstood and glaringly misused book, unless this challenge is heeded. "Adult education is bringing it [the Bible] back into current usefulness" (p. 80). Parent education is another much needed emphasis. Creative and group education cannot possibly succeed without adequate home coöperation. "However much we dress up and start them [the children] off to Sunday school, they are merely temporarily leaving their real Sunday school behind, the real school where they see the application of the principles taught, where they learn how precepts work out in practice. . . . If the Bible is not read with interest by the parents in the home . . . then it is not a living thing that one does not get along without in real life. If prayer is nothing more than that hurried mumble of stereotyped phrases just before one starts the real business of eating, prayer on other occasions will be an awkward performance, embarrassing and meaningless. . . . If life is one thing and religion another, then learning about religion is a side issue" (p. 87).

Most everything we read in this book has been said before and much of it many times. But seldom has anybody succeeded in saying so much so clearly, so frankly, and so fairly in so few pages. Whoever reads this volume will lay it down with a sincere feeling of gratitude for the author's contribution to the enrichment of cultural and religious background.

The author is unduly critical of the religious education movement. His statement on p. 25, "as usual religious education lags behind the secular," is open to question. The public school has learned a good many things from religious pioneers. We need only to mention a few: missionary education and project teaching, Christian social action and group work, the Sunday-school movement and adult education, creative teaching and home coöperation. Under the leadership of the Religious Education Association and the International Council of Religious Education, considerable progress was made in social motivation. More of the best religious educators find themselves in harmony with the author's "one-world" philosophy. But experience has taught them that coöperative work grows slowly. In order to carry groups along with them denominational and interdenominational directors have to be exceedingly patient. In curriculum building the terminology used is often most confusing because of past experiences. While one may disagree with certain theological positions, he has to admit that it is good pedagogy to start where people are and to let them learn by doing. Jesus did say: "You cannot put new wine into old wineskins," but he also made the statement: "I have yet many things to tell you, but you cannot bear them now." On the whole, the leaders in the International Council of Religious Education have made remarkable progress. To be sure, they have a long way to go.

They have been called communists by the Bible Presbyterians and fence-straddlers by the liberals. Let us not be too impatient with them. Mr. Johnson's emphasis of

the "one-world-pull" is greatly needed. Some leaders really are confused, especially those who are yielding to the temptation to welcome back the content-centred emphasis at the expense of the experience-centred approach. If it is necessary to go "slow," let us, at least, go in the right direction.

Many readers will not find it possible to go all the way with Mr. Johnson in his theological position. They will not "go so far as to conceive God as part of the growing process." They will prefer to stand with Harner, who believes that "God is in the process."

FRED H. WILLKENS

Saadia Gaon: The Book of Beliefs and Opinions, translated from the Arabic and the Hebrew by Samuel Rosenblatt, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1948, p. xxi, 496, $5.

The Yale Judaica Series, published on the Rabinowitz Foundation, has been auspiciously inaugurated by the publication, as Volume I, of the translation of the complete text of Saadia Gaon's famous *magnum opus, The Book of Opinions and Beliefs.* Dr. Samuel Rosenblatt, to whom we are indebted for this carefully prepared translation, is a well-known student of Judæo-Arabic literature, as shown by his authoritative edition of *The High Ways of Perfection* of Abraham Maimonides (Vol. I, New York, 1926; Vol. II, Baltimore, 1938).

This Jewish philosophic classic was written by Saadia in Arabic in Baghdad more than a thousand years ago, in 933, under the title *Kitāb al-Amānāt wa-l-I'tiqādāt* ("The Book of [Philosophic] Doctrines and [Religious] Beliefs"; see Malter, *Saadia Gaon,* p. 193). But it became better known among non-Arabic speaking Jews all over the world in Judah ibn Tibbon's Hebrew version, made in Lunel, Southern France, in 1186, and bearing the title *Sēfer hā-Emūnōt weha-Dē'ōt* ("The Book of Beliefs and Opinions"), a title adopted also in the present translation, owing probably to its popularity. It was in this version that Saadia's great work was studied by Jews through the Middle Ages and down to modern time.

The basic theory of *The Book of Beliefs and Opinions* is that philosophy and religion, if properly interpreted, do not contradict, but supplement each other. For both reason and religion have their origin in the same divine source, and one cannot, therefore, teach anything which is incompatible with the teaching of the other. It thus constitutes the earliest attempt at systematic presentation of Judaism as a rational body of beliefs.

The book appears to have been originally written as a series of separate treatises, which were later combined by the author into an organic whole, preceded by a general introduction. In its present form the work consists of ten treatises dealing with the following subjects: "(1) The creation of the world; (2) God's unity and other divine attributes; (3) The commandments of God and the means of their revelation; (4) Man's freedom to either obey or disobey God; (5) Virtue and vice; (6) Man's soul and its immortality; (7) The doctrine of resurrection; (8) The age of the Messiah and of Israel's redemption; (9) Reward and punishment in the hereafter, and (10) The golden mean" (translator's Introduction, p. xxv).

Dr. Rosenblatt is to be congratulated on performing a conscientious piece of work. It was no mean task to prepare a faithful translation of Saadia's profound work, which would be comprehensible to the general reader with no previous preparation. The brief introduction contains some pertinent information of the author's life and works. The ten treatises were subdivided in the translation into chapters, in order to facilitate their perusal, and an analytical table of contents has

been provided as an additional guide, in both instances following the example of the Josefow edition (1885) of Ibn Tibbon's Hebrew version. The page numbers of Landauer's edition of the Arabic text are supplied in the translation for easy references, and the few brief notes explain some deviations from the text, following Ibn Tibbon's version, and likewise contain some useful elucidations. The appendix contains a translation of the variant version of Treatise VII (Concerning the resurrection of the dead), which was the basis of Ibn Tibbon's Hebrew translation of this treatise. The two indices, (I) Subjects and Names, and (II) Passages Cited, will greatly facilitate the use of the volume, and, finally, the rather brief glossary of some technical terms will surely be appreciated by the general intelligent reader.

SOLOMON L. SKOSS

The Ethics of Israel, by Israel H. Weisfeld, New York, Bloch, 1948, pp. xvi, 360, $2.75.

This book makes no pretensions to be a philosophic or systematic treatise on ethics. It is rather an anthology—in the author's words (p. xiii), a "caravan of exalted Jewish ethical dicta, admonitions, stories and exhortations marching through time and space." The chapter headings are: God, Man, Brotherhood, Faith, Prayer, Humility, Truth, Charity, Righteousness and Justice, Peace, Honesty, Forgiveness; and each chapter includes selections ranging from Scripture to contemporary preachers. The sanction for ethical conduct is simply stated as the requirement for man, exercising moral choice, to follow patterns of behavior exemplified by God. Nothing is said of ritual observance, not even as symbolizing or supporting ethical conduct. The "questions or thought suggestions" at the close of each chapter would indicate that the book is intended for use by young people's discussion groups.

As an anthology the merits of the book are that it presents a judicious selection from eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Hasidic teachers who are not so easily accessible as the classic materials of Bible and rabbinic literature, and that the inclusion of moderns makes of ethics a living chain of tradition with immediate relevance for the whole rather than an antiquarian study of early stages of development. On the other hand, the critical reader is apt to remain unimpressed by modern mediocrities who repeat, without special distinction, notions long commonplace, or by such worldly prescriptions as a smoking pipe as a device for controlling temper (p. 344). Indeed the author is not infrequently mistaken in claiming uniqueness or primacy for a given ethical concept. On the other hand, there is very little of the apologetic or particularistic in the book; the tone is universalistic, and this is the more remarkable, for, as one gathers, the author's own outlook is one of orthodox observant Judaism.

Mechanically the book leaves much to be desired. The introductory paragraphs, usually a *hæc fabula docet,* are printed in smaller type; but the selections themselves are not further identified or located, nor are the sources of the translations given, nor is it always clear whether one is reading the *ipsissima verba* of the source or the editor's comments. Without a word of interpretation or indication of context it is sometimes difficult to see how a passage means what the editor would have it mean; the first selection, from Job, is a case in point. The biographical and bibliographical notes at the end of each passage, again not distinguished by typography, are frequently so brief as to be virtually meaningless; the two sentences on the Talmud (p. 11) are an example. But no one can take exception to the tone or aim of the book, and it may be more effective as an edifying text than the specialist reader would realize.

MOSES HADAS

A Guide Book to the Bible, by Alice Parmelee, New York, Harper, ©1948, pp. xi, 331, $3.50.

Miss Parmelee, at one time director of religious education at Calvary Church, New York, and author of several church-school workbooks, here presents for the common reader a running account of what is in the Bible and how it got there. The common reader will find it readable and understandable; one such said, "I liked it very much." Its style is smooth-flowing and novelistic. The author does not mean the book to be a substitute for the Bible; "it will have failed of its purpose unless it leads the reader on to the Scriptures themselves." There are some, but not many, Bible quotations in certain of the chapters. The accounts of the Bible books are not interspersed with citations of pertinent Bible passages, which citations would more effectively guide the reader to the Bible. At the end of the volume there is a table of Bible readings, listing topics and passages for the Old Testament (Part I of her book). This affords some guidance to the Bible. There is no such list for the New Testament (Part II of her book), a real deficiency not offset by the naïve statement that the New Testament "can easily be read in its entirety." A lot of it isn't easy reading.

The book "has no new facts or theories to impart." It "tries to organize our present knowledge into a connected story, and so make biblical scholarship available and interesting." It does that. The author is thoroughly up on scholarly information. She has told the story in an interesting and often fascinating manner. The book is thoroughly good reading. "I have attempted to recreate the vanished days in which the Bible was written and to summon its ancient authors from oblivion." She does it with a plentiful sprinkling of imagination in reconstructing historical settings, and often dramatically. She treats the Bible books in the chronological sequence of their emergence.

The author puts herself under a handicap by using the King James Version for quotations. A sample (p. 11; Gen. 2:10): "A river went out of Eden to water the garden; and from thence it was parted and became into four heads." Nobody talks such jargon as that. That doesn't "make biblical scholarship available." Biblical scholarship includes the scholarship that has produced the modern versions. To summon the ancient authors from oblivion includes summoning them from the oblivion in which they are embalmed in the King James Version. (She might have quoted the Moffatt version without fee, presumably, since Harper's owns the copyright on that version.) That same version led her into the illiteracy of speaking of "a seraphim" (p. 50).

In her chapter, "The Father of History," which treats of the valuable early source for the account of David's reign (II Sam. 9–20), she seems very sure that Abiathar wrote that document. She appropriately intimates that the choice lies between him and Ahimaaz for the distinction of being that author. The odds would seem to favor Ahimaaz rather than Abiathar (see R. H. Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament,* pp. 356 f.). Anyhow, the reiteration of Abiathar's name will give the average reader the impression that his authorship of the document is a thoroughly established fact, whereas it isn't.

There are some little foxes that spoil the vineyard. On p. 30 *strata* is used as though it were a singular noun. On p. 55 *Israel* is used for the southern kingdom, *Judah.* On p. 61 Athaliah is the daughter of Ahab and Jezebel, a very common and gratuitous assumption which the Bible is very careful not to make. On p. 72 Jehoiakim is deported, whereas, he was dead; it was Jehoiachin. On p. 74 Ezekiel spent his early years in Jerusalem "within sound of the Temple bells." Such bells are a creature of

the author's fancy. On p. 136 Esther is the last Old Testament book to be written, 125 B.C., a very questionable assertion. On pp. 143, 149, *Apocrypha* is followed by "was," though plainly used in the distributive sense, and therefore plural. On p. 182 Matthew is dated between 80 and 90, but on p. 187 Matthew is in existence by 75. On p. 210 there is no iota subscript under *eta*. On p. 219, "Paul kept copies of his letters." How does she know that?

Part III, "The Bible Through the Centuries," is well done; within it the most interesting chapter is the one on William Tyndale, "The Father of the English Bible."

There is "A Selected Bibliography," of very modest proportions. There is a complete index. Within the front and back covers there is a map of the biblical world, with a special inset map of Palestine.

This and every book that recaptures some of the radiance of the old, old story is to be welcomed, read, and enjoyed.

ELMER W. K. MOULD

The Bible: The Book of God and Man, by James A. Montgomery, Ventnor (N. J.), Ventnor Publishers, ©1948, pp. 108, $2.75.

Professor Montgomery, one of the outstanding biblical and orientalist scholars alive,[1] needs no introduction to the readers of CROZER QUARTERLY. In addition to numerous books and articles, he has given us the best commentary on Daniel (1927) in the *International Critical Commentary* series and has completed in manuscript the commentary on the Books of Kings in the same series (may it soon be printed!).

This little book on the Bible (Old and New Testaments, and Apocrypha) was written *con amore* and without technicalities. It almost looks as if the learned author had gathered around himself some small children and had told them the contents of the book. It is well known that it is much easier to write a highly technical doctoral dissertation than a book like this which brings information down to the level of children in a very attractive manner.

Giving us *multum in parvo,* Professor Montgomery surveys the contents of the Bible, and shows it to be both a revelation of God in history and a book of humanity. He pays particular attention to the gallery of biblical characters, and with innate chivalry introduces to us the ladies of the Bible. The two final chapters of the book are entitled "The Ego of the Psalms" and "The Revelation of God in Nature."

The book is written with charming simplicity, and yet exhibits mature wisdom. While intended for the young and the unlearned, it will again and again present some fresh interpretations and views of interest to the scholar. A few striking phrases may suffice to illustrate this. The name "Chronicles" means "state-archives" (p. 5); the genealogies of Genesis "represent the beginning of historical systematization in outline" (p. 15); ". . . the oratorio of Second Isaiah, who foresaw the glorification of Sion as the World's illuminator" (p. 21); "Ps. 19—a poet's anticipation of astronomy" (p. 23); Jacob—"'the Heeler,' hardly a complimentary interpretation" (p. 36); "Judith is the history of a Jewish Jeanne d'Arc" (p. 60); "the . . . 'Glory' of Yahweh is the aura of the divine Presence" (p. 88).

It is inevitable that not all the views presented will be accepted by biblical students. While a detailed discussion would hardly be suitable for a popular book of this kind, in which the critical analysis of the Pentateuch and the rest of the Bible is entirely ignored, the reviewer may be allowed to note some statements with which he wholly and heartily disagrees—which may of course mean that Montgomery is right! "But the Latin [*testamentum*] incorrectly renders the Greek word *diatheke,* which again correctly renders the Hebrew *berith,* 'covenant'" (p. 3); in reality, *diatheke* means "testament" while the correct Greek word for *berith* is *syntheke*

[1] Professor Montgomery died February 6, 1949.—ED.

(compact, treaty, covenant). The explanation of Lord of Hosts (Yahweh-Hosts) on pp. 16 f. seems far less plausible than that of W. R. Arnold (*Ephod and Ark,* pp. 142-148). Did Solomon actually plan the "centralization of his people's religion" in the Temple in Jerusalem, as Josiah did in 621 (p. 19)? Did Rome accomplish the "final destruction of the [Jewish] nation" (p. 21)? Have "all religions" been ethical (p. 23)? In fact, were any religions really ethical before Amos in 750 B.C.? Were the Sons of the Prophets "ascetic groups" (p. 32)? According to the Hammurabi Code, Sarah was *not* "within her rights in demanding" the ejection of Hagar (p. 34), and presumably her procedure was of questionable legality wherever she lived. David's permission to the Gibeonites to slay the descendants of Saul in order to obtain blood revenge (II Sam. 21), took place at the beginning, not at the end of David's reign (p. 34).

But despite such differences of opinion, this reviewer read the book with genuine pleasure and recommends it enthusiastically to all persons interested in the Bible.

ROBERT H. PFEIFFER

Essays on Freedom and Power, by John Emerich Edward Dalberg-Acton, Boston, Beacon, 1948, pp. 452, $5.

Upon reading this book the question arose: Has it been left to the Britisher to catch a vision of the whole scope of history in its deep, human significance and to sketch it in its most dramatic and engaging form? A. J. Toynbee's volumes, *A Study of History,* with their sweep of the ages and their grasp of the meaning of the rise and fall of civilizations, with history's tragic failure to preserve all the facts so essential to a complete understanding of that meaning, have been received with a genuine appreciation of their amazing breadth of knowledge and lucid interpretation.

Today his work is better known in America than that of his predecessor, Lord Acton (1834-1902), though the latter perhaps dealt with certain phases of history most close to American hearts and patriotic pride. For Lord Acton's greatest interest was in the long development of liberty through the course of human progress. But that course became at times so uncharted, so trackless in the wilderness of man's wanderings, that he despaired of ever being able to trace it in an unbroken highway and to present it clear for all to read.

In the mind and conviction of Lord Acton history is the guide of mankind to that which is worthy, noble, and of good report for society and the race. When it ceases to be this counselor, this, at times, harsh director, then it ceases to have any significance. For some authors, as for some peoples and nationalities, the end justifies the means, and evil, "the great lie," is condoned if it achieves the desired success. To Lord Acton this is blasphemy and the prostitution of the facts in the course of man's advance.

This moral concept of the meaning of human life finds its epitome in the quotations from Acton by Herman Finer, of the University of Chicago, who wrote the preface to these essays. "The inflexible integrity of the moral code is, to me, the secret of the authority, the dignity, the utility of History. If we may debase the currency for the sake of genius, or success, or rank, or reputation, we may debase it for the sake of a man's influence, of his religion, or his disgrace. Then History ceases to be a science, an arbiter of controversy, a guide of the wanderer, the upholder of that moral standard which the powers of the earth, and religion itself, tend constantly to depress." Or again: ". . . all history is the true demonstration of religion." ". . . the full exposition of truth is the great object for which the existence of mankind is prolonged on earth" and "liberty is the highest political end." It is this theme

which gives these essays an appeal to American readers. They bear such titles as: "The History of Freedom in Antiquity," "The History of Freedom in Christianity," "The Protestant Theory of Persecution," "Nationality," "The Political Cause of the American Revolution."

Citizens of the United States may find many surprises while reading this latter essay. It appeared first in the *Rambler,* May, 1861, and in this volume has its first reprint. Writes Acton: "Viewed in the light of recent events, the history of the American Republic is intelligible and singularly instructive. For the dissolution of the Union is no accidental or hasty or violent proceeding, but the normal and inevitable result of the long course of events, which trace their origin to the rise of the constitution itself. There we find the germs of the disunion that have taken seventy years to ripen, the beginning of an antagonism which constantly asserted itself and could never be reconciled, until the differences widened into a breach."

This will come as a shock. Concerning the Constitutional Convention Acton wrote: "It is astounding to observe the political wisdom, and still more the political foresight, which their deliberations exhibit. Franklin, indeed, appears to have been the only very foolish man among them, and his colleagues seem to have been aware of it. Washington presided, but he exercised very little influence upon the assembly, in which there were men who far exceeded him in intellectual power." Again: "Far from being the product of a democratic revolution, and of an opposition to English institutions, the Constitution of the United States was the result of a powerful reaction against democracy, and in favour of the tradition of the mother country."

Many of the members of the Convention are quoted as being in opposition to the establishment of representative government, at least of a democracy. Madison, Sherman, Gerry, Wilson, Morris—all questioned the trustworthiness of the people to govern. Alexander Hamilton, however, was positive in his opinion. "Representation alone will not do; demogogues will generally prevail; and, if separated, they will need a mutual check. This check is a monarch. . . . He ought to be hereditary, and to have so much power that it will not be his interest to risk much to acquire more." "John Adams had said that the English government might, if reformed, be made excellent." Hamilton said: "Purge it of its corruption, and give its popular branch equality of representation, and it would become an impracticable government; as it stands at present, with all its supposed defects, it is the most perfect government which ever existed." Mr. Dickinson, of Pennsylvania, "wished the Senate to consist of the most distinguished characters . . . bearing as strong a likeness to the British House of Lords as possible."

It may be well for Americans to read the sources of their own history; or at least to have these sources appear in the history books of our public schools.

These essays by the great British historian have long been out of print, and this collection is not only the first to appear in many years but it is the first to be produced by an American scholar. Miss Gertrude Himmelfarb on a fellowship from the University of Chicago spent a year at Cambridge University gathering her materials. Not only has she made a wise choice from the abundance of the author's works but she has written an illuminating introduction of insight and understanding.

R. E. E. HARKNESS

Voices of Liberalism: 2, Boston, Beacon, 1948, pp. viii, 273, $2.50.

The first volume in this series of *Voices of Liberalism* is *Religious Liberals Reply,* by Jay William Hudson and six other authors, which was reviewed by the

present writer in CROZER QUARTERLY, January, 1948, pp. 71 f. That volume is a vigorous attack by liberal Protestants and new humanists, upon the contemporary neoörthodox movement.

The volume now under review consists of more constructive affirmations of liberal religious faith by nineteen contributors, of whom twelve are eminent contemporary Unitarians, and the remainder hold views that in general are in harmony with Unitarianism. Perhaps this book could be regarded as a confession of contemporary Unitarian faith. It is deeply spiritual, and representative of what most of us regard as the more attractive type of Unitarianism. It should win good will and respect for the Unitarian standpoint, both on the part of conservative Protestants and also of radical new humanists.

Eight, at least, of the contributions to this volume had already appeared elsewhere, and were written for purposes other than inclusion in this book. However, this is not as serious an objection as might be supposed. One good result is that a wide variety of topics are touched upon, "including all the fields of endeavor to personal sanity," as well as Unitarian theology. Unitarians are shown to have an interest in all of the more serious personal and social problems of our time, and to be able to make constructive suggestions which deserve general consideration and do not necessarily imply acceptance of Unitarian theology.

It is impossible to report upon any of these essays in detail. I can offer only a few random quotations. President Stoddard's plea is for "a recognition of the basic reality of conflict in human nature and human affairs, for holding a balance of power between the two forces inherent in man and his environment" (p. 3). Giovanni Pioli urges the pope "to stress the *moral* side of Christianity, while limiting to a minimum the doctrinal interpretation of moral and religious intuitions and feelings" (p. 18). A. Powell Davis observes that "Jesus was never a Christian. . . . I am not sure that Jesus would ever have wanted to be a Christian, or that he would want to be one, now" (p. 33). Frederick May Eliot quotes the "great passage" from Jefferson: "I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man" (p. 43). James Luther Adams reminds us that "the enemies of the Gospel were not the conspicuously evil men of the time of Jesus, but rather the conspicuously good men" (p. 53). Albert Einstein shows that religion and science are not irreconcilable, and affirms that "those individuals to whom we owe the great achievements of science were all of them imbued with the truly religious conviction that this universe of ours is something perfect and susceptible to the rational striving for knowledge . . . inspired by Spinoza's 'amor Dei intellectualis'" (p. 252).

WILLIAM K. WRIGHT

The Symbol of the Faith: A Study of the Apostles' Creed, by George Hedley, New York, Macmillan, 1948, pp. xi, 173, $2.50.

Dr. Hedley's purpose in collecting this series of sermons on the various articles of the Apostles' Creed was "to interpret the Apostles' Creed in terms both of its history and of modern ways of thinking." It was not to be a compendium of Christian theology but a "brief and simple discussion" along with an attempt to "identify the living values which from the first that phrasing [*sc.* of the creed] sought to convey." The author explicitly states that he regards himself as orthodox in the sense that he avoids the "current major heresies of American Protestantism: the 'modernist' and the 'fundamentalist.'" He says he is avoiding Apollinarianism and Socinianism. Whether this be so or otherwise—and surely his view that Mothers' Day should be regarded as "a kind of Protestant substitute (perhaps not very adequate, but none-

theless real) for the adoration of Mary" (p. 48) is neither Apollinarian nor Socinian! —let us concern ourselves with history rather than theology. The author appeals to ancient authors in his preface. His acquaintance with them appears to be rather superficial.

The idea that the *Didache* is earlier than Matthew 28:19 is highly improbable (p. 10). Ignatius was not bishop of Smyrna but of Antioch (p. 11 and elsewhere); since his dates are not precisely known, the years 110, 115, and 117, all of which are given, are equally possible but their use suggests a certain indecision. In *Apol.* I, 33, 4 Justin does not say that Mary remained a virgin (p. 44) but that she was a virgin when she became pregnant. The view which "became standard in the Church" was that she remained a virgin after the birth of Jesus. If Thomas Aquinas is to be given the title "saint," presumably we are following the Roman system (p. 154); in this case Clement of Alexandria should not be called "saint" since he was dropped from the list by Clement VIII; and certainly no one ever thought Eusebius of Cæsarea (p. 157) was qualified. It was not "(pseudo-) Tertullian" (p. 157) who wrote against Marcion but Tertullian himself. The statement " 'Catholic' means simply 'universal': no more and no less" (p. 119) becomes untrue apparently as early as the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* 16:2 (cf. G. Bardy, *La théologie de l'Église de saint Clément de Rome à saint Irénée* [Paris, 1945], p. 66). The translation of the creed of Marcellus of Ancyra (p. 13) is inaccurate in rendering *anastanta,* "risen," by "raised," and in omitting the final phrase, "and eternal life." Furthermore, the whole picture of the development of the creed is wrongly based on A. C. McGiffert's study published in 1902; it neglects the contributions of Holl, Lietzmann, and F. J. Badcock (London, 1938), which have revolutionized creedal studies. In regard to the change in Anglican thought from physical to spiritual resurrection, it was not "casual and almost accidental" (p. 16), but due almost entirely to the teaching of Bishop Westcott, as K. Lake has shown in his *Immortality and the Modern Mind.* Finally, to imply that "symbol" in the ancient sense has any relation to "simple symbol" as used by modern writers is thoroughly misleading (p. 5).

New Testament criticism is perhaps more widely diffused than patristic studies. But no one not a thoroughgoing form critic could accept the sweeping statement that the gospels are "as to specific detail undependable authorities for the career of Jesus of Nazareth" (p. 30). For some details they are dependable; for others they are not. Moreover, on this basis how can the author say (p. 63) that the Gospel of Mark covers more than a year of Jesus' ministry in a single chapter? And the best witnesses to Luke 24:51 omit "he was carried up into heaven" (p. 84).

There seems to be a strong note of romantic archaism in the book, evidenced by the indiscriminate use of the title "St.," by the plea for the word "Ghost" in "Holy Ghost," and by the use of ancient language to conceal modern doubt. Few modern Christians can cast the first stone, however, and I can only suggest that the book needs tightening up and further investigation of what the fathers said rather than of what later writers said they said.

ROBERT M. GRANT

Christian Science and Philosophy, by Henry W. Steiger, New York, Philosophical Library, ©1948, pp. xi, 234, $3.75.

Most books on Christian Science published thus far have dealt chiefly with Mrs. Eddy, the founder, and the organization growing out of her work. The majority of such books have been strongly, not to say violently, partisan, for or against. That is, of course, the normal thing to expect when a movement is new, and especially when it represents some rather striking departure from accustomed ways

of thinking. Christian Science does this and has come in for a vast amount of bitter opposition. There is great need for a good objective treatment of the whole movement: one that will not occupy itself so much with the personal founder and her idiosyncrasies but with the teachings of the movement on its own merits.

The book under review does not meet this need. It is not wholly objective. The author frankly acknowledges that he is of the faith, and one has the feeling that he is laboring a case rather than dispassionately considering the teaching on its own merits. Even so it is a very welcome book, if for no other reason than that it is not primarily preoccupied with Mrs. Eddy but views the teaching itself, and attempts to deal with it systematically as a philosophy.

The author was not a Christian Scientist in his earlier years. His interest in it was awakened by a lecture on Christian Science which he heard, but it was not until a year later, when he first attended a Christian Science service, that he resolved to investigate it. He took up the study of Mrs. Eddy's writings, which caused him no little struggle, but it was the pragmatic evidence of the truth of the doctrine that kept him at it until he finally became convinced that he had found in it a "coherent and philosophically tenable religious concept." His confidence in the reliability of Mrs. Eddy's writings grew with experience. Her leadership was for him based on "merit not dogmatic authority."

He found little help from published sources. What little had been written by philosophers of note he found inadequate or misleading. Only Borden P. Bowne, William James, Woodbridge Riley, and Douglas Macintosh among the philosophers had written of it. To the author it is "astonishing that a movement which has been going on for eighty years and which even uses the word *science* in its name should not have been examined more carefully from an academic point of view." Yet Christian Scientists themselves have done nothing important in the field. The movement, he thinks, cannot expect fair treatment of its own doctrine "unless from its own ranks efforts are made to lay the necessary ground work."

This book is an attempt to do just that, and however adequate or inadequate it may prove to be, it is likely that it will be provocative of other efforts by competent scholars in the field of philosophy to consider it as a philosophy. It will be interesting to see how Christian Scientists react to the effort. The fact that the book is a doctoral dissertation, which earned for the author a doctorate of philosophy under so eminent a philosopher as Edgar S. Brightman, must indicate a measure of competence in the academic field of philosophy on the part of the author.

The book is divided into two parts: the doctrine of Christian Science as 1. a metaphysical system and 2. as a science. As a metaphysical system it is considered from the standpoint of 1. ontology, 2. epistemology, and 3. ethics. In treating it as a science, he first analyzes Christian Science healing, examines Christian Science as a science, and discusses the need of a scientific theology. In a concluding chapter a point-by-point presentation of a philosophy of Christian Science is given. On the basis of the definitions of God, Man, and Mortal Mind there follow certain inferences which the author thinks may properly be drawn. Here is a brief summary which, if one has not time to read the entire book, affords the reader a comprehensive statement of Christian Science as a philosophy as seen by Mr. Steiger. (There is no room here for even a very brief summary of this philosophy, but a few observations on the book as a whole are in order.)

First, it seems to this reviewer that the chapter comparing Christian Science with other philosophies leaves a good deal to be desired, particularly its comparison with Indian thought. Nor does the author do anything like full justice to Hegelianism.

He pays little or no attention to the charge made by Haushalter that Mrs. Eddy purloined from Hegel. It is true that since his attempt is to discuss Christian Science "as is," as a philosophy, he is not obliged to disclose its sources, but since the charge has been so openly made of plagiarism from Hegel, one might have looked for more than a passing reference to it. He finds the fundamental difference between the systems to be in the lack in Hegel of "any authority for the establishment of his metaphysical system comparable to that which Christian Science healing gives to the doctrine of Christian Science."

It is precisely at this point that the reviewer finds the greatest difficulty in following Mr. Steiger. The healings, or protection afforded in critical situations, are for him the guarantee of the philosophic truth which Christian Science holds. Two things strike me as an evidence of weakness in the author as an exponent of this philosophy. One is his naïve acceptance of testimony without submitting it to rigid tests. For example, the case cited in the *Christian Science Journal* of December 15, 1945, which recounts the adventures of a Christian Scientist in the Pacific theatre of the war, who attributes his miraculous preservation during a lengthy period of travel, with a company of other people, to the fact that he had cabled his Christian Science teacher "that work for guidance be done once a week until he was heard from again." Mr. Steiger remarks: "The testimony shows that the separation of practitioner and patient by thousands of miles was no obstacle to the demonstration of Christian Science." He does a little later remark that, of course, we do not know what would have happened if no Christian Science practice had been available, but this acknowledgment does not seem in the least degree to affect his conclusion. Nor, again, does the fact that people are also healed by Father Divine and by Unity and by Catholic saints seem to disturb him, though he would not, indeed could not, consistently agree that this proves the truth of their respective philosophies. The nearest he comes to facing this question is to assert in one place that the important question in such healings is whether "such healings result from the undertanding of a metaphysical position, or are faith cures." I have heard claims by Dr. Frank B. Robinson, founder of Psychiana, of having cured people in distant places who had no knowledge that he was operating in their behalf, also the cure of very small children, so that no claim of *faith* as the basis of the cure could be made. Would this argue the truth of their respective philosophies?

Nonetheless, this is, I repeat, a welcome book. Some competent academic philosopher who has no predilection for Christian Science ought to make a thorough-going examination of it and criticize it from the standpoint of technical philosophy. If it be insisted in the end, as is more than halfway suggested, that one cannot really evaluate it until he has yielded himself to it, then the technical verdict upon it is likely to be that it is not, after all, so much a philosophy, as it is a faith and an experience—a religious philosophy doubtless, but perhaps not quite qualifying as a truly *"scientific* philosophy or metaphysics."

CHARLES S. BRADEN

Conscious Clay, by William Allison Shimer, New York, Scribner, 1948, pp. xii, 199, $2.50.

Here is a book written out of long and intimate experience with students by William A. Shimer, a man who knows the problems that puzzle students, and sees them in the light of rich experience. He is trained in science and philosophy; he has studied abroad, has been secretary of Phi Beta Kappa, and president of a college, and is now professor of philosophy at the University of Hawaii.

In *Conscious Clay,* Dr. Shimer discusses frankly many of the individual and

social problems which constitute the stuff of what is called philosophy of life. The book is divided into three parts. Part I is "Mind and Atomic Energy," and deals with such topics as life, God, certainty, immortality, group personality, the invisible, and prayer. Part II discusses "Value and Religion." Here good and evil, the church, and creative living are taken up. Part III is "Love, Death and Progress." Love and marriage, war, progress, education, and worship are treated here.

Few readers will find themselves in agreement with all the ideas set forth in this volume. Philosophically, the point of view is that of a somewhat vague idealistic pantheism which finds immortality in a "personality-body"—which turns out to be a figurative way of expressing an immortality of influence that follows after individual mortality.

But anyone who misses a chance to read *Conscious Clay* because of its dubious metaphysics is making a great mistake. The book is written in a captivating style, which lures the reader's interest, and it contains many wise and helpful observations. Its pantheism is stated in pithy phrase: "This vital universe is God." "To some extent, even God's divinity is in our keeping." "Nature thought the thoughts of Plato, drank the hemlock, defied the cross." "Consciousness is a cosmic flood." The principle of creativity is emphasized, as by Whitehead, H. N. Wieman, and Edwin Lewis.

Although pantheists usually minimize the individual person, Dr. Shimer finds room not only for "the unified personality of God" but also for the development of human personality as a fundamental value, even if the literal survival of the individual beyond death is denied.

Shimer has no sympathy with the antirationalism of the present. He recognizes courageous faith is necessary because reason can give only probability; but his rock-bottom principle is that "reason must approve." This reasonable faith leads Shimer to confidence in divine purpose, even if that purpose may lead eventually not only "to the destruction of humanity, but of every trace of man." Here we have a faith that has an element of the sublime in it; but it lacks a concretely empirical basis in theory of value. If all value is "in, of and for a person," as T. H. Green held, and if every personality is an intrinsic value, a faith that is willing to sweep persons aside for the "personality-body" may well need revision. Had Dr. Shimer asserted only that the future of value does not depend on the continuance of life on this earth, he would have had a better case, provided personal immortality is true.

Shimer's interpretation of many ethical questions and his criticisms of hedonism are penetrating. His book is not only a good one for inquiring students; it is one that will be profitable reading for any teacher of religion in college, seminary, or pulpit.

EDGAR SHEFFIELD BRIGHTMAN

Christian Paths to Self-Acceptance, by Robert H. Bonthius, New York, King's Crown, 1948, pp. xiii, 254, $3.25.

Not often does one encounter such a helpful fusion of the insights of religion and the techniques of modern psychotherapy. The author faces in two directions without contradictions and without serious ambiguity. He is successful in maintaining a delicate balance between the unmistakable services of religion in the "cure of souls" and the confident claims of medical psychology as mediator of renewal, power, and wholeness to distraught human beings. There is clear evidence that the author's point of view is grounded in careful scholarship in the field of religion, comprehensive acquaintance with the literature of psychotherapy, and systematic observation of procedures and results in the treatment of mental and emotional distress.

Yes there are some indications that Dr. Bonthius would prefer to take his stand in the enlightened camp of scientific therapists whose methods are "explorative" and "explicative" than to be found among those less illumined religious practitioners whose methods are "normative" and "educational." In his treatment of the Christian approaches to self-acceptance, the tone is critical and challenging; in describing the psychotherapeutic approach, the flavor is eulogistic and roundly commendatory.

The Christian pathways selected for analysis are: 1. the rejectionist, best represented in the theology of Calvin and the Reformers; 2. the forensic, reflected in the practices of the Roman Catholic Church (confession, penance, absolution, etc.); and 3. the meliorist, radiating the confidence and instilling the assurance characteristic of Protestant liberalism. For the author, all of these pathways have some elements of strength and soundness, yet every one of them has some serious deficiency. The rejectionist pathway tends toward despair through overemphasis upon sin and human helplessness; the forensic pathway encourages dependence and fails to engender a sense of personal autonomy and responsibility; the meliorist affirms man's possibilities and emphasizes God's love, thus providing the indispensable polarity within which individuals may recover or maintain their integrity and achieve an increasing measure of fulfillment. Obviously, those who tread the meliorist path are never far from the kingdom.

But the end is not yet. Any approach sufficient to modern man's need for self-acceptance must relieve him of his chronic sense of guilt, give him insight into his personal equipment, alleviate his frustration, and abolish his feeling of isolation. From this book one gets the impression that for such an assignment the psychotherapeutic pathway is uniquely adequate. When religion incorporates within its efforts the singularly "psychotherapeutic components" of expression, responsibility, appreciation, benevolent relationship, and choice of goals, then its function of human redemption and rehabilitation may be exercised with a precision and certainty hitherto rarely achieved.

The book is well worth reading. It will inspire self-criticism in ministers, teachers, parents, and theological students. It will prompt all of us to examine and re-evaluate the presuppositions and the devices which we employ in our ministries of healing and comfort and release.

FRANK T. WILSON

Learning and World Peace, edited by Lyman Bryson, Louis Finkelstein, and Robert M. MacIver, New York, Conference on Science, Philosophy and Religion [Harper], 1948, pp. xix, 694, $6.50.

This symposium consists of more than sixty short essays by distinguished theologians, scientists, philosophers, and political scientists who participated as lecturers in the eighth meeting of the Conference on Science, Philosophy and Religion in session at Philadelphia in September, 1947. Though the papers offer a variety in topics and a diversity in content, the common theme is a search for the road to world peace. The subject matter is generally rewarding. Most of the essays are fresh and stimulating; a few are quite trivial. It is no reflection upon the editors that the volume lacks continuity, for there is no apparent order that they might have used for the arrangement of such a collection.

If one is searching for specific instructions about world peace, he will not find them in these essays. Their excellence lies neither in a description of methods nor in an explanation of plans for action but rather in discriminating analyses of complex social situations and human responses to modern environment. The summaries

are not always assuring, because the authors are aware that time is running out much too fast for the necessary adjustments. In his discussion of "Causation and Conscience," one of the best papers in the volume, Buell G. Gallagher concludes: "Basically, the discovery of and building of world community is a religious problem. . . . On the other hand . . . there may be reason to doubt whether professional theologians of any of the three great religious communities of the Western World will be able to transcend their vested interests in present commitments so as to give constructive answers to the present problems. . . . And in the meantime, mankind waits, while time and the atomic armaments race do not."

There is much value in the critical comments which appear with the essays. In most instances the writer defends or explains his position after each criticism, thereby throwing additional light upon his text. An improvement could be made by the editors of future editions by selecting commentators from different groups for these critical notes. The sociologist disagrees with a sociologist in terms of the trade. So it is with theologians, philosophers, and physicists. It would be more stimulating and useful to require the theologian to defend his position in a test with the physicists, or the physicist with the philosopher, or the philosopher with the sociologist, or the sociologist with the theologian. In the present volume the critical comments are too much within the various groups. They do not cut across the boundaries to make for integration and unity. Truth is one, and scholars should so manifest it.

The volume is chiefly valuable as a digest of current scholarly thought. Though the essays are short, one might properly assume that each writer has taken good care to present one of his best ideas. Without reference to world peace the discussions form a thoughtful appraisal of human society by men who have proven their competence in scholarship.

REUBEN E. ALLEY

Psychiatry and Religion, edited by Joshua Loth Liebman, Boston, Beacon, 1948, pp. xix, 202, $3.

In October, 1947, the Temple Israel Institute on Religion and Psychiatry was held in Boston under the guidance of Joshua Loth Liebman, whose first publication, *Peace of Mind,* became a nationwide classic. From the two-day meetings of religious leaders, psychiatrists, and psychoanalysts there came the present volume. Perhaps, as one of the discussion leaders said, "One of the most important things about these two days of meeting is that they *are being held*" (p. 177).

The word "and" in the title is both divisive and unitive. Psychiatry and religion have specific fields and yet they unite for a common purpose. Part One discusses where they meet and part, and what it says is interesting both for content and manner. The three writers clearly show themselves to be three types of men, with three types of interests, approaches, and methods: the lecturer and student; the church authoritarian; and the teacher and pastor of people. Similar content and manner occur in Part Two, "Hospital Care of the Mentally Ill," and Part Three, "The Individual and His Environment."

Here is a problem greater than the meeting of psychiatry and religion. It is one of life's hardest tasks to be tolerant without being patronizing, to be sympathetic without feeling self-righteous, to be loyal without being prejudiced, to distinguish between union and unity. The contributors have made great progress toward a solution of the problem, but perfection here, as elsewhere, is still an ideal. What they have undeniably done is to introduce a common meeting ground for understanding.

The volume would be much stronger if all the authors of chapters had written as well as Hiltner and Liebman, had covered their topics as well as these two. But they have not. This makes not only for unevenness, but for discursiveness. Although all the areas covered are important to the minister of religion, the discussion of the grief situation will probably receive his greatest attention. Here is a most valuable contribution to his ministry, and what is said should be studied carefully by young ministers especially. It is a strategic field of pastoral care and one where we all have much to learn. This reinforcement of Dr. Liebman's chapter in *Peace of Mind* is extremely valuable.

No disparagement of the volume is intended by saying that the comment of the discussion leader, quoted above, may be equally true of the book itself.

ROBERT E. KEIGHTON

The Lord's Supper: Seven Meanings, by Harold E. Fey, New York, Harper, ©1948, pp. 117, $1.50.

This little volume from the pen of the managing editor of the *Christian Century* is well worth the most careful consideration of all who are called upon to administer or participate in the Lord's supper in every sectarian connection. It appears at a time when endeavors for ecumenicity are abroad in the world, all of which meet a snag when it is proposed to hold a communion service at the time of their conferences. Amsterdam was a bright example of the thirst for church unity but there had to be four services of communion because of the divisions among the denominations joining in the launching of the World Council of Churches. The book was evidently written before that event, but the fact that the one ordinance of the church designed to set forth Christian unity has become a striking example of disunity is noted by Dr. Fey.

The low temperature of Christian spirituality in these days is a further reason for study along the lines indicated in this well-wrought little book. As the author says: "But the fact that the Protestant observance of the Lord's Supper is largely sterile, ritualistic and unintelligent, that the Roman Catholic mass is thickly encrusted with superstition and materialism, that the Eastern churches still seek to propitiate God with an offering dominated by the barbaric theology of the days of Charlemagne, is not unrelated to the low state of spiritual health which marks present-day Christianity." That is to make us think.

It is a comfort to this reviewer that Dr. Fey accepts as the fundamental premise of his book the doctrine taught by Zwingli that the elements used in remembrance of Christ in the communion are symbols: "We do not have to unearth Christ from beneath the accumulation of centuries of magic and superstition which is the Roman Catholic mass."

On this base, the author proceeds to elucidate the seven meanings of the communion which gives the title to the book. These are complementary to the fundamental character of the observance, but they are not exclusive. There may be other meanings quite as valuable. Those mentioned, each of which is the subject of a chapter in the volume, are: memorial, thanksgiving, covenant, affirmation, spiritual strength, atonement, and immortality. The thoughtful preacher may find more than one sermon lurking in these pages.

This Baptist found one flaw in the work. The various names given to this observance of the church as reported by Dr. Fey do not record the word *ordinance.* Baptists talk of the ordinance of the Lord's supper far more than they do about "The Eucharist." Dr. Fey, being a member of the Disciples of Christ, is a cousin

of ours. He must not resent being mildly rebuked for an oversight. Indeed this is more than made up for by the discriminating chapter in which he deals with the birth and evolution of the idea of transubstantiation. That is a good chapter. The final chapter deals with the increasing observance of World Communion Sunday. He seems to exaggerate the importance of this just a little, I think, but it may be a step in the direction of intercommunion which all Christians should practice if the world is to believe that Christ was divinely sent into the world. But read the book.

HOWARD WAYNE SMITH

Preaching and the Dramatic Arts, by E. Winston Jones, New York, Macmillan, 1948, pp. ix, 123, $2.

The words *art* and *drama* are generally in disrepute among preachers. They seem to raise spectres of artificiality and insincerity. To speak of the sermon as a form of art or of preaching as a form of drama is to sound a tocsin among the prophets. Suppose, then, we say that a sermon is the systematic application of knowledge and skill toward effecting a desired result; that preaching is the portrayal of thought, or situation, or experience, or truth—what you will—in a lifelike manner and in accordance with the knowledge of the laws of the desired human response. Agreed? Well, all we have done is to employ definition and avoid affective connotation. We have also prepared ourselves to accept Jones' thesis that "the vital function of preaching is only fulfilled as it partakes of the nature of the drama" (p. 3).

Preaching must contain an appeal to the emotions, as part of the whole psychophysical organism. There are limits to reason, but beyond those limits are the power of imagination, that is, "the means of acquiring wisdom through vicarious experience" (p. 19) and the poetic touch that uses words for their power to vivify ideals and create moods. Since the dramatic arts use attention, interest, movement, the conflict of loyalties, the portrayal and development of character, human interest, and a manner that is appropriate to the message, so the sermon should contain these elements and preaching should employ these methods. In such a light of understanding this book becomes a strong and effective plea for the best use, in the best manner, of the best material. ". . . just now the pulpit stands desperately in need of a new note of earnestness and a manner in keeping with that note" (p. 123).

In a way it may be called a book on the psychology of preaching and of audience reaction. As such it is, indirectly, a manual for the preparation and delivery of sermons. Unfortunately it is the kind of book usually thought of for advanced study, while actually the material and the point of view are entirely basic to preaching. The question is not whether a minister shall or shall not use the dramatic arts —he cannot help using them. The question is how much and how well he uses them. If we are to handle skills by necessity, we should employ them skillfully. It would be very difficult to imagine a preacher who does not need the chapters of this book.

There is one personal comment: the material seems to lack the use of the dramatic arts it argues for preaching whenever the psychologist is called in to be coauthor with the dramatist.

ROBERT E. KEIGHTON

John Hales of Eton, by James Hinsdale Elson, New York, King's Crown, 1948, pp. 199, $2.50.

This is a well-written, thoroughly documented book, deeply interesting to anyone who would know what formative persons and ideas created the "modern" mind in

the English-speaking world. John Oman in our day pointed out that the most significant movement in western religion was not the Reformation but a movement two centuries nearer to our own time which is generally called the Enlightenment. It gave reason its rightful place as it declared that nothing is of the nature of true religion or of true mortality which is not a man's own. Thenceforth "authority," indispensable in religion as in everyday life, becomes mentor and not master, guide and not despot. For each man, ultimate decisions are made in the throne room of his own personality.

John Hales of Eton was an influential figure in the seventeenth century when free churches were becoming a reality in England and were being transplanted across the Atlantic, there to shape the America of today. Hales remained a devoted Anglican but an advocate of the widest tolerance and liberty. In fact, for a century after his death, he was quoted on these great issues more frequently than his illustrious contemporary, John Milton.

The times in which Hales lived were tumultuous. He was born on Easter Sunday, April 19, 1584, four years before the destruction of the Invincible Armada of Catholic Spain. He died, May 19, 1656, in the protectorship of Oliver Cromwell. A graduate of Oxford University, he became a fellow of Eton College, professor of Greek, a position he held for thirty-six years until 1649. Andrew Marvell visited him in those last years of poverty and said on the basis of long acquaintance, "One of the clearest heads and best prepared breasts in Christendom."

The literary output of Hales is not large. He was a scholar among his books, averse to the "brawles" of religion. His sermons on important occasions were "snatched" from him, says an editor. And yet in his way he was outspoken and zealous in the propagation of his ideas. In 1683, John Pearson published *Golden Remains of the ever-Memorable Mr. John Hales of Eton College.* The oft-used adjective "ever-Memorable" has done much to preserve interest in a man thus honored.

Famous among his sermons is "Abuses of Hard Places of Scripture." He believed that the authority of the Bible was in the "plain places," which, nevertheless, he was unwilling to catalogue. "Now concerning the merriment newly started," said he in one of his tracts, "I mean the requiring of a catalogue of fundamentals, I need to answer no more, but what Abraham tells the rich man in hell, 'they have Moses and the prophets.' "

In 1636, the year Roger Williams, man of action, was embodying religious liberty in the first free civil state in history, John Hales published the tract entitled *Schism and Schismaticks.* Dissenters did not fail to quote the words which define the true church in terms of the performance of the genuine functions of religion: "All pious assemblies in times of persecution and corruption, however practised, are indeed, or rather alone, the lawful congregations: and public assemblies, though according to form of law, are indeed nothing else but riots and conventicles, if they be stained with corruption and superstition."

The erudite and fair-minded author of this biography does not place Hales among "the giants of the seventeenth century." That honor is given to men more positive in their beliefs and more vigorous in their actions. The "ever-Memorable" man, in any given age with its special problems, passes from the centre of human attention when those problems are transcended in the fulfillments of history.

RICHARD M. VAUGHAN

The Pilgrimage of Peter Strong, by Paul Geren, New York, Harper, ©1948, pp. 229 (illustrated), $2.75.

The fact that this volume was written by the author of *Burma Diary* recommends it immediately to all who have read the latter book. Any one who has enjoyed the unusual flavor of *Burma Diary* will be anxious to travel here and there with the somewhat whimsical Peter Strong.

The Pilgrimage of Peter Strong is clearly autobiographical in its interpretation of various observations. It is Mr. Geren's own spiritual pilgrimage in quest of the church invisible, of whose reality he finds abundant evidence in such different places and among peoples of such different races, customs, and creeds. His pilgrimage began in a Texas town, in a home beside the railway tracks, but it led him into distant lands after a sojourn in a community in Arkansas where sinners were urged in every church service to come down the aisle and profess Jesus Christ if they wished to be saved. One day Peter walked down the aisle as the people sang "When I Survey the Wondrous Cross." Later he found himself in the church at the Great University, and he began to think of the church universal. Next he was a teacher in a Christian college in Rangoon until he became an ambulance driver in the army in Burma, and a stretcher carrier, ministering to the sick and wounded in hospitals and villages.

In the third-class compartments on Indian railways he found evidence of the brotherhood of man, as also among beggars, the untouchables, the worshipers in a cathedral of the Church of India and under the shadow of the Taj Mahal. He was catching new intimations of the church invisible. He found his way to Kashmir and there pondered both shepherds and sheep, and while he pondered the shepherds he decided to join the United States Army in India, requesting that he be made a medical soldier, "the most shepherdly of all the soldierly occupations." Always in quest of the church invisible!

On the battlefield Peter stayed days and nights, seeking the wounded and bringing them home again, like a good shepherd. He said the battlefield is no place for a shepherd, nor is it any place for sheep. But since sheep are there for slaughter, some shepherds also must be there; and the medical aid is now the shepherd. So he reflected. He saw men die and became used to it, but also he became convinced of "Eternity in the midst of Time." If a shell should get him, "It would be all right, it would be everlastingly all right. Now nothing can be lost, nothing can be forgotten." And what splendid souls he found among brown and yellow men. Among backward peoples he found graces and gifts of high order—"Members of the family of the beautiful by holiness." He found "The Familiar Beautiful in Unfamiliar Places."

Peter Strong's eyes were not blind to the attractions of womanhood, as interesting chapters reveal, but his was a quest for lasting values.

A chapter is devoted to "The Church Invisible and the Battlefield." On the eve of battle men attend the early morning service and kneel in the mud to take communion, many feeling that probably death lies not far ahead. At such an hour denominational barriers are lowered, and each group welcomes aid from others. There is a common feeling of the need of cleanliness. At last a shell found Peter. The grave appears to open for him, and he tells of experiences that seem real to him "on the margin of heaven."

Then comes Peace! The great Peace! Peter is back home again, but he continues to live in his soul in the church invisible, while on Sundays he teaches in the little wooden Baptist church building some of the truths he learned on his pilgrimage, and

the people liked it. Peter wished to continue his pilgrimage through life. But the soles of his shoes are thin from much walking, he soliloquizes. The bodies are bent. The laces are broken. The heels are turned over. He needs a new pair. "Hand down a pair of seven-league boots—we have the whole world to traverse!"

JAMES H. FRANKLIN

The Most-Favored-Nation Clause, by Richard Carlton Snyder, New York, King's Crown, 1948, pp. xi, 264, $2.75.

Professor Snyder, of Princeton University, here provides us with a compact analysis of the commercial treaties of the period between the two world wars and particularly of the scope and intent of the "most-favored-nation" policy of the United States, which the author ably defends. The most-favored-nation clause in United States tariff treaties is motivated by the desire to protect our country's trade from discrimination abroad, but it differs from economic nationalism by placing the commercial welfare of the participating nations on a common ground.

It is of vital concern to nation-states to further and to protect their commerce and industry and to seek agreements whereby they shall not fall into competitive disadvantage in the world market. Dr. Snyder clearly illustrates how various nations have shown a dual concern, each of them desiring 1. that its foreign commerce receive equally favorable treatment among the other states, and 2. that concessions extended to others will likewise be extended to it. The most-favored-nation clause is an instrument of international bargaining, designed to achieve these ends, in which two states contract to extend to one another any concessions extended by either to a third nation. Thus A would face no higher tariffs on its exports to B than the nation which pays the least, and A's nationals would have the same commercial privileges and immunities which obtain for the subjects of other states who operate within B's domain.

The most-favored-nation clause has been of indispensable service for the conception of the world as an interdependent economic whole, in which trade between nations is regarded as trade between integral parts of a world competitive economy. But as Snyder indicates, since the world economic collapse of 1929-1932 the desire to protect national economies has overshadowed the desire for equality of treatment (competition), and evasions of the clause have greatly increased through the use of nontariff trade controls such as import quotas, state monopoly purchases, clearing agreements and exchange controls. Snyder defends the United States reciprocal trade agreements policy as the only example of an attempt to revive and extend the most-favored-nation clause against these other barriers.

The author sees three possible future courses: the gradual discard of the clause, in favor of bilateral bargaining; the application of the clause to nontariff forms of discrimination such as trade quotas and exchange controls; and a return to prewar practices whereby reciprocal trade treaties will become the basis of commercial policy, and quantitative restrictions will be eliminated.

The tenth and eleventh chapters of this book provide a brief but penetrating defense of United States reciprocal trade policies, and are useful for those who are concerned for more liberal legislation than was enacted by the last Congress.

VERNON H. HOLLOWAY

BOOK NOTICES

Alternative to Futility, by Elton Trueblood, New York, Harper, ©1948, pp. 124, $1.

Our time is full of challenges. We are challenged by juvenile delinquency, political corruption, labor unrest. We are challenged by the impending doom of another war, by the hunger and cold of millions throughout the world, by racial and social misunderstanding and unrest. There are those that are even touched by the moral and spiritual decay which they feel to be responsible for the general breakdown of our time. When we behold all of these bewildering challenges, we are left with a terrible sense of awful futility. *Alternative to Futility* is an attempt to bring the challenge of the Christian faith to bear upon individuals in such a way that they will be moved with "concern" into a "redemptive society." The author rightly points to the fact that men have turned to vehicles other than the church because they have "found no satisfaction within present day Protestantism or Catholicism." This tragedy is due not to the fact that the church demands too much, but rather that it demands too little. There must be a church which goes beyond both of these. The author then proceeds to point out five minimum conditions of membership in the new Church Universal: 1. There must be commitment by a full act of will to faith in God, that this is his world, and that he is like Jesus Christ. 2. Committed souls will "witness" without apology for their faith. 3. Fellowship will be "deep and inclusive"; we must be disciples, catholics, and above all brethren. 4. Membership in the new order requires the acceptance of "vocation." The Protestant concept of the universal priesthood of all believers must be broadened to include not only the approach to God but also to men. "Make all, within your society, members of the crew and permit no passengers." 5. There must be loyal acceptance of discipline which will include worship, solitude, silence, humanity, and austerity. "The major strategy is to turn all present church members, one by one, into participants in a truly redemptive society." *Alternative to Futility* is a challenge of a positive faith, not the account of the challenges of a negative world. This challenge, if accepted, will ultimately lead to triumph over the evil that is in the world.

PAUL E. SCHMOYER

Understanding Adults, by Donald R. Gorham, Philadelphia, Judson, ©1948, pp. viii, 162, $2.

This little book is comprised of ten brief chapters especially planned for textbook use by church school leaders of adult groups. The author, who is the head of the department of psychology and education of Keuka College, frankly states that his purpose in writing this book was to set forth some basic principle which has been found sound, to think about and discuss some problems of human development and adjustment, and to stimulate interest and further reading and study among church school leaders of adults. Such a purpose immediately limits the scope of the book. It must be simple and as free as possible from technical terms. The author who is seeking to help adults understand adults in terms of growth, development, problems, and religious needs through a sound psychological and educational approach tackles a rather difficult task. Many times the reviewer felt that perhaps the author feared that the psychology he was injecting might upset the unprepared reader and so became a preacher rather than teacher. The psychology and educational principles introduced

are simple but sound. The book will, of course, be to the average minister what a child's elementary reader is to the schoolteacher. The book is useful for the adult who is seeking to guide adults and who has not had the privilege of study in the field of psychology and education on the college level. The book will be helpful to the adult leaders who are prone to emphasize content teaching and subject matter as over against creative experience. States the author, "Creative experience is the most significant characteristic of humans." He advocates emphasis upon thinking and upon the stimulation of a problem-solving attitude. This is especially rewarding on the adult level and should be the goal of leaders for these groups. The author has several paragraphs at the close of each chapter under the heading, "For Study and Discussion." These suggestions are practical and should stimulate discussion on the part of the teacher and the pupils in the class periods. Helpful books are mentioned for further reading. The book is better than the average published for use in denominational training work. Nothing new could be expected in such a textbook.

JAMES HOUSTON IVEY

Lands of the Cross and Crescent, by Cyrus H. Gordon, Ventnor (N. J.), Ventnor Publishers, ©1948, pp. 267, $3.75.

This volume is the chronicle of personal observations and judgments of the social customs, cultural achievements, political aspirations, and religious attitudes and practices of some sixteen different national and cultural units—nine under the Crescent and seven under the Cross—among whom the author at times has lived during the last fifteen years. In each chapter relating to lands visited, features of geology and geography, together with important incidents in history, usually form an introduction to the body of the narrative. For the historian these scanty and undocumented introductions are quite unnecessary; to the reader unacquainted with ancient history and Semitic lore they may be either meaningless or even misleading. Naturally these studies are "neither balanced nor complete"; yet as descriptions and evaluations of one man's opinion, and that within limited areas, they are quite beyond reproach. The writer is an alert, inquisitive, widely read scholar, who could easily qualify as a journalist of a much needed type. In addition to the quota of exact information gained from reading the volume, the conviction is strengthened that in various parts of the world, in the midst of bewildering chaos and by means of tragic struggle, humanity is on the march. Progress is being achieved in the mechanization of industry, in bettering the economic condition of the underprivileged, in gaining rights of minorities, and in democratizing governments, though educational programs are in a sorry mess. The crass materialism so rampant in the United States, with its culture so often equated with bathroom fixtures, comes in for critical and righteous condemnation. To those willing to gain a comparative and nonchauvinistic view of the American way of life this volume, especially pp. 225-261, offers a wholesome specific. While Professor Gordon's peculiar responsibility lies in the field of Assyriology and kindred subjects, it is to be hoped that other by-products of his studies may be forthcoming.

I. G. MATTHEWS

Gaining the Faith You Need, by James Gordon Gilkey, New York, Macmillan, 1948, pp. ix, 118, $2.

Dr. Gilkey's books are always stimulating and helpful, and this new volume is no exception. The author is a past master at helping people think through their religious problems and perplexing life situations. Since he writes frankly from a liberal point of view, much of his theology and many of his conclusions are unacceptable to

conservative readers. This fact limits the effectiveness of his book with those who cannot accept his liberal premises. All readers, however, will find stimulation and guidance from the very helpful suggestions Dr. Gilkey presents about finding God and the meaning of life. Any reader who thinks through this volume will not only find helpful guidance in making God more real in life, but will also find some very timely suggestions about how to make the Christian life more effective and to live more happily in the world of our day. As is true of the author's other volumes, there are many striking stories and illustrations, though some of them are repetitions from his previous books. Particularly effective also in this volume is the use of poetry. Dr. Gilkey outlines the purpose of the volume as he states that he is convinced of two things: "First, that most of the religious difficulties of our educated people of today spring from intellectual confusion rather than moral conduct. The second is that the cure for these difficulties must come from a clear statement of the content of our modern faith and of the arguments which support that faith. It is this cure for religious difficulties which the present volume means to present."

THEODORE F. ADAMS

The Home of the Rural Pastor, by Ralph A. Felton, Madison (N. J.), Drew Theological Seminary, ©1948, pp. 111, 40 cents (paper).

This booklet is the result of a statistical study of 1,171 parsonages by a group of graduate students of Drew Theological Seminary. Within the 111 pages are sixty-nine photographs, nine architectural plans, and thirty-four statistical tables. The chapters deal with general information regarding the size, location, and condition of parsonages; also the garage and outside surroundings. The booklet reminds one of a U. S. D. A. or land-grant college extension pamphlet. A church committee that has the responsibility of building a new parsonage will find in this booklet many items to consider, and the church committees in charge of parsonages will note that parsonages often lack numerous conveniences which would facilitate the work of their spiritual leaders and would add to the comfort of their families. Ministers will find the booklet helpful in furnishing and arranging a study for creative work, interviews, and general use. Probably of all readers, the wives of ministers will be most interested since they are the caretakers of the homes. It is not extravagant to assume that the great majority of them would like to be given the opportunity to make their requests for the kind of kitchen, laundry, and standard equipment which the booklet mentions. The reviewer has never lived in a parsonage which even approximated the "musts" for a well-equipped minister's home. But he is inclined to believe that a parsonage according to its conveniences and usableness has a distinct influence upon the minister and his program. This idea seems to be implied in the table on the tenure of the pastors in the 1,171 parsonages which indicates, as is generally known, that a large percentage of ministers is always on the move.

HAROLD BANCROFT WHITE

William Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury: His Life and Thought, by F. A. Iremonger, New York, Oxford University Press, ©1948, pp. xv, 663, $6.50.

I had the privilege of attending the Lambeth Conference in London this past summer. We were met at Southampton by Mrs. Temple, chairman of the Hospitality Committee. Her efficiency was exceeded only by her graciousness. We missed William Temple at the Conference very much, but Mrs. Temple did everything in her power to

make our stay a pleasant one. I am glad that Dean Iremonger emphasizes the real part that Mrs. Temple played in her husband's life and work. This is a most readable biography, written with great restraint. In it one gets a picture of the moving forces in England's life during Temple's time. Temple was a leader in many of these movements, but his leadership is not allowed to obscure the movement itself. I had the privilege of being present at the Oxford 1937 Life and Work Conference. Everyone there seemed to trust Temple. He was selected to write the message of the Conference and sat up the good part of a night to do it. Perhaps one of the reasons why Temple was able to do such things was that he had very little or no rewriting to do. I heard him give a series of lectures at the College of Preachers in Washington. He had no notes. The lectures were taken down by a stenographer and published (*The Centrality of Christ*) with only one or two verbal changes. A wise church would have freed such a leader from the crushing burden of administrative work (Temple at that time was Archbishop of York) and would have enabled him to devote all of his time and thought to the great issues confronting the world. But he was called upon to succeed Lang as Archbishop of Canterbury. As one reads those fascinating chapters about his life as the "Primate of All England," one wonders how any human could have done it all. He gave himself "unremittingly alike to the largest and smallest problems" and his interests and influence went round the world. Dean Iremonger reminds us that a book remains to be produced in which more adequate attention can be given to Temple's theology and philosophy. Dorothy Emmet's chapter on Temple's philosophy is well done, as one would expect, but obviously is only an outline. Dean Iremonger has given us a fine biography of Temple, the man, the great Christian leader, the peoples' archbishop.

OLIVER J. HART

The Changing Scene in China, by John Gilbert Hindley Baker, New York, Friendship Press, ©1948, pp. vii, 152, $1.

A small volume on a large theme, by a man whose education in England and America, travels in China and service in schools, refugee camps, and otherwise in that country qualify him to write on the topic he has chosen. In imagination he takes his readers into China "over the hump" by plane from India or Burma and drops them in Zunan Province, at Kunming, which was a most exciting melting pot during all the years when Japan was attempting to conquer China from the east. Mr. Baker does not attempt to paint a picture with a few bold strokes, but rather with innumerable details. He gives intimate glimpses of Chinese life, including the extreme poverty of multitudes who had lost their homes and practically all personal possessions in fleeing before the invaders. He tells how professors and students in numerous colleges, with almost incredible hardships, migrated a thousand miles or more to far West China and resumed work in shacks. He tells of the impact of native and foreign armies, with disruption of life in many respects; of the arrival of Chennault's Volunteers, the Flying Tigers; of the forces and supplies over the Stilwell Road; of the effect of these events on the social life of Asia. The author shows how the events of a single decade have caused kaleidoscopic changes in China, some of which have been largely beneficial. In the turmoil the Christian forces, especially the leaders, have been disciplined and in many instances made more heroic. It is to Mr. Baker's credit that he does not paint a picture showing only silver linings to dark clouds in China. He calls definite attention to the country's great weakness: corruption in high places.

JAMES H. FRANKLIN

Doors into Life, by Douglas V. Steere, New York, Harper, ©1948, pp. 189, $2.

Douglas Steere, of Haverford, is out to school us in the disciplines of regular devotion. His *Prayer and Worship* and his *On Beginning from Within* were written around that purpose. In his new book he has chosen to intepret five masters of devotion, men whose teachings feed the soul and put iron into the will. On the *Imitation* innumerable essays have been written, but there is always room for one more as good as Steere's. Francis de Sales, however, with his *Introduction to the Devout Life,* is generally little known to Protestants. John Woolman rightly claims more and more attention and admiration, but of course a Quaker like Steere is best suited to expound him afresh. Within twenty years Kierkegaard, dead now nearly a century, has come powerfully to life in the English language, and is now quite inescapable in religious thought. The lay reader may well be referred to Steere's essay for a revealing introduction to him. Von Hügel's family deserves to grow from generation to generation. His *Selected Letters* surely serve better the general reader than his weightier volumes. In each case the professor takes us sympathetically into the author's life; then offers us some guiding ideas on the journey within from the author's writing. The catholicity of choice is notable: pre-Reformation Dutch Catholic, post-Reformation Catholic Bishop of Geneva, colonial New Jersey Friend, iconoclastic Danish Lutheran, and (how describe Von Hügel in a phrase?) broad-minded English cosmopolitan, "modernist," yet loyal Roman Catholic. Yet the total impact of the book, in Douglas Steere's competent hands, is unified enough. On the levels where these men live, there is a freemasonry of appreciation that the dogmatists and analysts may never know.

JOHN W. BRUSH

Government and the Arts of Obedience, by William W. Hollister, New York, King's Crown, 1948, pp. 139, $2.

This concise study in political theory appears to have been prepared as a doctoral dissertation at Columbia University. Soundly documented, with notes and bibliography attractively arranged at the back of the book, it draws upon about one hundred principal authorities who represent the most significant political thought of modern Europe and America, particularly the contemporary. It interprets conventional views from the standpoint of democracy, and ventures to modify classic writers like Hobbes, Locke, and Montesquieu. Mr. Hollister sees government as a process of group obedience which should follow custom and convention rather than conflict and coercion. Domination and command should be based upon honor and social solidarity. Representation, an advanced form of government, rests less upon civic virtue than upon reciprocity of interests; it is expressed in leadership and administration revealing trust and accepted social purpose. Power should not seek ends in itself, but should be manifested under men and conditions as flexible and effective as traffic rules. Education and persuasion are its vindication. Ethical norms and virtue have an accepted place. Although little is said about Plato and the quest for justice which so intrigued him, Aristotle's functional processes are accepted, and Kant is well analyzed and applied. The chapter on Leadership is likely to appeal most to readers of the present review, through its recognition of transforming inner experiences which enrich social life. Second Isaiah's "suffering servant," St. Francis, Lincoln, and Jesus are taken as ideal leaders. The leader's art lies in his sensing the wishes of his followers; his strategy consists in action which win the confidence of the group. Ministers and ecclesiastical administrators may apply in their own vocational field many of the suggestions of this study of secular government. Using the

discriminating terminology of advanced semantics, the author maintains high standards of scholarship and presents a thesis calculated to strengthen the reader's loyalty to democracy and liberally tolerant religion.

EARL CRANSTON

Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work: Selected Papers, 1947, edited by Gertrude Springer, New York, Columbia University Press, 1948, pp. xi, 512, $5.

Each year the volume of selected papers read at the annual meeting of the National Conference of Social Work reflects the changing American and international scene. For this and other reasons the present collection is of great value. The nearly fifty articles have been arranged under classified headings: Science and Social Work, International Aspects of Social Work, National Economic and Social Issues, Responsibility of Government, The Citizen Organizes for Social Welfare, Concepts and Trends in Casework, Particular Areas of Social Work, Delinquents, Aged, Education for Social Work, and National Mental Health. Throughout the papers there appears the emphasis on human values, the necessity of recognizing the psychodynamics of human relationships. Arlien Johnson calls attention, for example, to the research of the Harvard Business Administration: "After twenty-five years of careful observation and experimentation, they report that productivity in industry depends far more upon the workers' satisfaction in coöperative activity in well-knit human groups than it does upon economic incentives. The success or failure of an individual is more closely related to his ability to form coöperative social relationships with his fellow workers than it is related to the degree of his technical skills." Will the "hard-boiled" school of business ever learn? Clergymen interested in "thoughts for sermons" will discover plenty of them between the covers of this book. They will find stressed in scientific and philosophical terms many of the principles which liberally minded men have been emphasizing for a long time. The volume gives us a picture of reality in many areas of human life. At the same time there is, in most of the contributions, a blending of practical idealism. Goals of achievement are held up which, for the most part, bear a genuine relationship to cultural aims that may be attained in our time.

RAY H. ABRAMS

Essence of Hinduism, by Swami Nikhilananda, Boston, Beacon, 1948, pp. 118, $1.75.

The present reviewer does not pretend to any expert knowledge of Hinduism. However, since this book has been written for laymen, it would seem that there was some excuse for one not skilled to attempt a review. The three sections of the book: Faith for Today, Transformation of Western Culture into a Spiritual Culture, and Immortality, are the result of three lectures to three separate audiences (all of them non-Hindu), and here, it seems to me, is found the one great weakness in the continuity of the book as a whole. Many passages in one lecture are repeated, virtually verbatim, in the next. The information given, however, is of great interest, well presented, and, so far as I am able to judge, authoritative. The results of seven thousand years of tradition and thought are made surprisingly clear in so short a work; and there are some passages which will arrest any thoughtful reader's attention. Particularly valuable are the comparisons which the author makes between varying concepts of God, and of good and evil, in the several major religions of the world. I recommend this book to anyone interested in the study of the growth of religion as a whole.

THEODORE VERNON ENSLIN II

Selected Poems of John Oxenham, edited by Charles L. Wallis, New York, Harper, ©1948, pp. xxvi, 178, $2.

For the past quarter of a century John Oxenham has been moving quietly in and out of our religious reading; here a poem on "The Ways" and there a group of "Sacraments." To others he gave an imperishable charm to "The Hidden Years." Always the writer of simple devotion, he spoke surely, with a commanding sincerity. Now we have 143 of his poems and a brief sketch of his life by his daughter Erica Oxenham, presented in a volume that will revive memories and quicken appreciation. It is not unkind to say that Oxenham was not a great poet; he would have been the first to disclaim any such patronizing misjudgment. It would be unkind either to imply or infer that his poems have no greatness—so long as our hymnbooks contain "'Mid All the Traffic of the Ways" and "In Christ there is No East or West."

ROBERT E. KEIGHTON

Art and Religion, by Von Ogden Vogt, Boston, rev. ed., Beacon, 1948, pp. xvii, 280, $4.50.

When this book was first published in 1921 there was a judgment and a prophecy in the opening paragraphs of the Introduction: ". . . few seem to be aware of the cleft between religion and art. A new age is coming. It will be upon us swiftly and we must bestir our imaginations to prepare for it" (p. 1). The book closed with the pronouncement: "If the satisfaction of the artist is the life of beauty, the joy of the Christian is the Beauty of Life, all life, man's life, the Life of God" (p. 251). Between these two was a wealth of stimulating material that made clear the case for art and religion. The text of the present edition is identical with the first, except for the Preface, some of the illustrations, and the material in the Appendix. This latter contains orders of worship used by the First Unitarian Society of Chicago. Those who have felt that the volume was a classic in its field will be glad of its new availability and will once again recommend it to others. Those who are to read it for the first time will wish they had known it all these years.

ROBERT E. KEIGHTON

Our Protestant Heritage, by members of the faculty of Union Theological Seminary in Virginia, Richmond, John Knox Press, ©1948, pp. 224, $3.

Seven successive Monday night lectures, in popular style, aimed at the educated layman, form the contents of this volume. John Bright in the first lecture, "From Patriarch and Prophet," makes the point that Protestantism is a viewpoint, a state of mind, and that it has biblical roots. This he capably illustrates from the Old Testament, pointing out that the Protestant religion has at its heart a concern for social righteousness and ethical conduct. Balmer H. Kelly and Donald G. Miller take the discussion through later Hebrew history and the life and teachings of Jesus, while the fourth one, by James E. Bear, treats of the testimony of the Apostle Paul. Ernest Trice Thompson in the fifth lecture, "Through Growth and Decay," covers fourteen hundred years of church history, in nineteen pages. He makes a neat summary of the distinguishing points in which Protestantism differs from Catholicism. John Newton Thomas in "Protesting for the Truth" treats of the reformation theology with an almost overemphasis on Luther. Benjamin R. Lacy, Jr., in "A Dynamic Tradition: Christianity in the New World" speaks with conviction for a rebirth of the feeling of vocation, which each Christian must feel—the sense of divine responsibility in doing whatever work we are individually called to do. As Protestants, we have a heavy share of responsibility for this nation and for the world.

Notes to the various lectures are gathered together at the end of the volume. The authors are to be severally commended, not only for having undertaken so difficult a task, but also for having done it so well. EDWARD C. STARR

A Study of Psalm 72(71), by Roland E. Murphy, Washington, Catholic University of America Press, 1948, pp. vii, 144, $1.50.

This is a publication of a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Sacred Theology at the Catholic University of America. It is one of the most extensive studies ever made of a single psalm, and merits a place in the forefront of psalm studies. An original translation, introduction, excellent commentary, and more general observations on the psalm cover one hundred pages. A review of "Traditional and Modern Interpretations," from the church fathers, Jewish tradition, and modern times covers thirty-four pages. The nine-page bibliography and the four-page index make this an indispensable study for anyone who is working in the psalms. Although leaning heavily on Catholic authorities, the author is almost equally acquainted with Protestant scholars. He is especially careful to present in a fair way all variant views, making a veritable compendium of knowledge on this psalm. Issue may be taken with the conclusions at several points. 1. The date is ascribed to the time of the prophet Zechariah (pp. 4, 72), but it seems rather to have been composed in the prime of Solomon's reign by an infatuated admirer who envisaged an eventual unlimited world empire for his sovereign. 2. Instead of this psalm being "prophecy," and "written by a prophet" (p. 14) who was making a synopsis of prophetic messianic expectations (p. 91), it seems more likely Psalm 72 is the seed from which all later messianic expectation grew. 3. He dismisses too lightly the contributions of Protestant scholars, who regard this as a psalm of the kingship rather than "messianic," as "wild speculation on the psalter current during the nineteenth century" (p. 124). Even though it seems doubtful if he can be followed in his main contention, that the psalm is messianic (p. 98), no future study of either messianism or Psalm 72 can ignore this exhaustive and careful study. ROLLAND E. WOLFE

Studies in Christian Enthusiasm, by Geoffrey F. Nuttall, Wallingford (Pa.), Pendle Hill, 1948, pp. 96, 50 cents.

Every student of history and literature knows that the respectable Englishmen of Wesley's century deplored "enthusiasm." The word means originally "God within," and implies a belief in God's power to possess a person and speak his true word through him. Ann Hutchinson, in the previous century, had been damned for making such a claim for herself. Dr. Nuttall, of New College, London, studies briefly a handful of the earliest Friends for this element, this vocal and muscular fervor that often ran into hysteria, fanaticism, and moral error. Best known of the four types studied is James Nayler, an admirable exemplar of the purest Quaker loving-kindness, yet unfortunately notorious for his strange lapse into messianic delusions. The phenomena of enthusiasm are observed with deep sympathy, for the author is convinced that our own age of Christians needs a new depth of experience and a new realization of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. He shows us how the extreme forms of enthusiasm tended to disappear from the Friends' movement, or to be drained off into the inchoate Ranter people, yet not without some degree of loss. How vast is the literature of Quaker history; yet there always seems some new area to explore. Dr. Nuttall suggests (pp. 14-15) that we need a "synoptic study" of enthusiasm in Christian history. His little book would form one good chapter in that effort.

JOHN WOOLMAN BRUSH

BOOKS RECEIVED

**Bering's Successors, 1745-1780,* by James R. Masterson and Helen Brower, Seattle, University of Washington Press, 1948, pp. vii, 96, $2.

**Religion,* by Nathaniel Micklem, New York, Oxford University Press, 1948, pp. 224, $2.

**The Political Community,* by Sebastian de Grazia, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, ©1948, pp. xx, 258, $4..

**The New Science of Giambattista Vico,* translated (from the third edition, 1744) by Thomas Goddard Bergin and Max Harold Fisch, Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1948, pp. xv, 398, $5.

**Pastoral Work and Pastoral Counseling,* by Russell L. Dicks, rev. ed., New York, Macmillan, 1949, pp. xii, 195, $2.50.

**Mass Man and Religion,* by E. G. Lee, New York, Harper, n.d., pp. 160, $2.50.

**Keeping Men on Their Feet,* by Frederick Keller Stamm, New York, Harper, ©1949, pp. 192, $2.

**The Common Ventures of Life,* by Elton Trueblood, New York, Harper, ©1949, pp. 124, $1.

**Seventh Baptist World Congress,* edited by Walter O. Lewis, London, Baptist World Alliance, 1948, pp. x, 171, 12/6d.

**Jesus, Son of Man,* by George S. Duncan, New York, Macmillan, 1949, pp. xvi, 290, $3.50.

Man's Restless Search, by Barbara Spofford Morgan, New York, Harper, ©1949, pp. 224, $2.50.

This is a reissue, somewhat revised and with changed title, of *Skeptic's Search for God,* which appeared in 1947 and was reviewed in the January, 1948, issue, pp. 78 f.

Capsules of Wisdom, compiled by Max L. Forman, New York, Bloch, 1948, pp. xii, 210, $2.50.

2500 "punch lines to put across a message." Compiled by a rabbi to promote synagogue life, they will probably seem almost equally useful to many Protestant ministers who believe in wayside pulpits, bulletin boards, and other forms of chaste advertising.

The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible, by Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield, Philadelphia, Presbyterian and Reformed, 1948, pp. vii, 442, $3.75.

The fact that the scholarly author of these reprinted articles died nearly thirty years ago, after valiantly long outliving many of his views, will probably not disturb most of the readers who are likely to want to struggle with this volume nearly so much as the embarrassing habit the doughty Princeton professor had of making free use of Greek, Latin, and Hebrew.

**Man's Disorder and God's Design: the Amsterdam Assembly Series,* New York, Harper, n.d., pp. 210, 218, 197, 228, $5.

**The Best of Studdert Kennedy,* New York, Harper, ©1948, pp. x, 173, $2.

**Things That Matter,* edited by Frederick Ward Kates, New York, Harper, ©1949, pp. vii, 132, $1.50.

**The Audacity of Faith,* by Allan A. Hunter, New York, Harper, ©1949, pp. 154, $1.75.

The Autobiography of a Plain Preacher, by Raymond H. Huse, Boston, Meador, ©1949, pp. 121, $1.50.

In these days of the big shots and brass hats there is fortunately still plenty of room for the more ordinary mortals who never make headlines but who do their work and find life well worth living. And there is also a place for their reminiscences and memories although fated never to become best sellers or known outside the circle of their friends.

**Pastoral Counseling,* by Seward Hiltner, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, ©1949, pp. 291, $3.

**The Philosophy of Anaxagoras,* by Felix M. Cleve, New York, King's Crown, 1949, pp. xix, 165, $3.

**How to Think Creatively,* by Eliot D. Hutchinson, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, ©1949, pp. 237, $2.75.

**Toward the Great Awakening,* by Sidney W. Powell, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, ©1949, pp. 173, $2.

**Secular Illusion or Christian Realism?* by D. R. Davies, New York, Macmillan, 1949, pp. xv, 111, $2.

**Religious Liberty,* by Cecil Northcott, New York, Macmillan, 1949, pp. 128, $2.

**Bearing Witness to the Truth,* by Harold Cooke Phillips, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, ©1949, pp. 219, $2.50.

**Emperor Frederick II,* by David G. Einstein, New York, Philosophical Library, ©1949, pp. 427, $4.50.

**The English New Testament: from Tyndale to the Revised Standard Version,* by Luther A. Weigle, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, ©1949, pp. 158, $2.

**Christian Humanism and the Modern World,* by Lynn Harold Hough, Toronto, Ryerson, ©1948, pp. 60, $1.50.

**A Brief Essay about the Gods and My Friends,* by Louis Aaron Reitmeister, Great Neck (N. Y.), Walden Press, 1948, pp. 56, $2.

**The Church-School Teacher's Job,* by Mildred Moody Eakin and Frank Eakin, New York, Macmillan, 1949, pp. ix, 233, $2.75.

**The Cost of Discipleship,* by Dietrich Bonhoeffer, New York, Macmillan, 1949, pp. 199, $2.50.

**Critique of Practical Reason of Immanuel Kant,* translated by Lewis White Beck, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, ©1949, pp. ix, 370, $5.

**Southeast Asia,* by Kenneth P. Landon, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, ©1949, pp. ix, 215, $4.

**Édouard Estaunié: the Perplexed Positivist,* by Ruth Carter Hok, New York, King's Crown, 1949, pp. 116, $2.25.

**The Purpose of the Gospels,* by Ernest F. Scott, New York, Scribner, 1949, pp. vii, 171, $2.50.

**The Church's Ministry in Our Time,* by Henry Knox Sherrill, New York, Scribner, 1949, pp. viii, 162, $2.

**Protestantism Faces Its Educational Task Together,* by William Clayton Bower and Percy Roy Hayward, Appleton (Wisc.), C. C. Nelson, ©1949, pp. xi, 292, $3.25.

**Resources for Worship,* by A. C. Reid, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, ©1949, pp. 154, $2.

**Humanism as a Philosophy,* by Corliss Lamont, New York, Philosophical Library, ©1949, pp. 368, $3.75.

**Sacred History,* by Daniel-Rops, New York, Longmans Green, 1949, pp. xi, 433, $4.50.

**Discrimination and National Welfare,* edited by R. M. MacIver, New York, Harper, ©1949, pp. 135, $2.

**Reconstruction in Philosophy,* by John Dewey, rev. ed., Boston, Beacon, ©1948, pp. xl, 224, $2.75.

* To be reviewed.